School of Theology at Claremont
10017001165

# NAZARETH

## AND THE

# BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

## A NEW VIEW BASED UPON PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

WITH CRITICAL APPENDICES, INCLUDING UNNOTICED PRECANONICAL READINGS; A DISCUSSION OF THE BIRTHPLACE OF JESUS; AND THE TEXT OF WHAT IS BELIEVED TO BE THE HITHERTO UNDISCOVERED SOURCE OF THE PROPHECY, THAT THE MESSIAH 'SHOULD BE CALLED A NAZARENE'

BY

CHAMPLIN BURRAGE, B.Litt.
LIBRARIAN OF MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

OXFORD
PRINTED BY HORACE HART
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: PUBLISHED BY HUMPHREY MILFORD
1914

*Price Three Shillings and Sixpence net*

BT
235
B87
1914

The Library
of
Claremont
School of
Theology

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
(909) 447-2589

BT
235
.B87
1914

# NAZARETH

## AND THE

# BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

### A NEW VIEW BASED UPON PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

WITH CRITICAL APPENDICES, INCLUDING UNNOTICED PRECANONICAL READINGS; A DISCUSSION OF THE BIRTHPLACE OF JESUS; AND THE TEXT OF WHAT IS BELIEVED TO BE THE HITHERTO UNDISCOVERED SOURCE OF THE PROPHECY, THAT THE MESSIAH 'SHOULD BE CALLED A NAZARENE'

BY

CHAMPLIN BURRAGE, B.Litt.

LIBRARIAN OF MANCHESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD

OXFORD
PRINTED BY HORACE HART
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: PUBLISHED BY HUMPHREY MILFORD
1914

LIBRARY
CLAREMONT SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
1325 N. COLLEGE AVE.
CLAREMONT, CA 91711-3199

# PREFACE

THE publication of the following pages has been chiefly occasioned by the accidental discovery, during the prosecution of quite other philological investigations, of what I consider to be the source of the prophecy that the Messiah 'should be called a Nazarene'—the very passage which in my opinion the writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews must have had before him when he originally wrote the words now embodied in our canonical Matthew.

The quest for a passage or passages which would explain this obscure prophecy has been a long one. In Jerome's day, and probably even before, search for it had begun to be made. Says Jerome in a note relating to Isaiah xi. 1:[1] 'Illud quod in euangelio Matthæi omnes quærunt ecclesiastici, & non inueniunt vbi scriptum sit: Quoniam Nazaræus vocabitur: eruditi Hebræorum de hoc loco assumptum putant. . . .' Indeed so baffling to all research has this problem proved, that it had become probable that the solution was only likely to be reached by accident.

Through the encouragement of friends this identification has been followed up by other investigations, with the result that a brief article has been expanded into the form in which it is now presented. The results have been arranged as follows: The main discussion is devoted to an outline study of the development of early Christianity from a new point of view, while many details upon which the statements are based are reserved for a series of critical

[1] See his Commentary on Isaiah.

appendices. In the latter the reader may consult the general critical apparatus that forms the necessary foundation of any such philological investigation, as well as various additional kindred points of interest. This latter section consists of hitherto unnoticed variant readings of portions of the canonical Gospels, &c., valuable for purposes of criticism.

In these researches it has been my privilege to make use of the works of various authorities, without which the conclusions offered here would have been far less easy to reach and far less complete even than they now are. Among the books consulted, I would name with a special sense of obligation Professor F. C. Burkitt's valuable paper entitled *The Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names* (Proceedings of the British Academy, vol. v), London, 1913; and Dr. Edwin A. Abbott's learned *Miscellanea Evangelica* (*I*), London and Edinburgh, 1913.

Finally, I wish to thank my friends Col. Owen Williams, Professor Walter Scott, Dr. James Moffatt, and Dr. Henry Bradley for timely advice and encouragement. The views herein expressed are, however, my own, except as otherwise indicated.

C. B.

OXFORD, *February* 6, 1914.

# NAZARETH

## AND THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

### A NEW VIEW BASED UPON PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

At the beginning of the Christian era there were a number of Jewish sects which one can find enumerated and described in any book of reference relating to the subject. Among these are mentioned the Nazarites (Nazirites) or holy ones of God, ascetics who wore long hair, did not drink wine or strong drink, &c. They appear to have closely resembled the Essenes of whom and of whose manner of life Pliny the Elder, who lived about A. D. 23–79, has given the following graphic description, together with various geographical details of some interest in the present discussion. He says:[1]

15. Iordanes amnis oritur e fonte Paniade, qui cognomen dedit Caesareae de qua dicemus, amnis amoenus et quatenus locorum situs patitur ambitiosus adcolisque se praebens velut invitus Asphaltiten lacum dirum natura petit, a quo postremo ebibitur aquasque laudatas perdit pestilentibus mixtas. ergo ubi prima convallium fuit occasio, in lacum se fundit quem plures Genesaram vocant, . . .

17. Ab occidente litora Esseni fugiunt usque qua nocent, gens sola, et in toto orbe praeter ceteras mira, sine ulla femina, omni venere abdicata, sine pecunia, socia palmarum. in diem ex aequo convenarum turba renascitur large frequentantibus quos vita fessos ad mores eorum fortunae fluctibus agit. ita per seculorum milia (incredibile dictu) gens aeterna est, in qua nemo nascitur. tam fecunda illis aliorum vitae paenitentia est. Infra hos Engada oppidum fuit, secundum ab Hierosolymis fertilitate palmetorumque

[1] C. Plinii Secundi, *Nat. Hist.* v. 15 and 17 (ed. of Ludovicus Ianus), Lipsiae, 1854.

nemoribus, nunc alterum bustum. inde Masada castellum in rupe et ipsum haut procul Asphaltite. Et hactenus Iudaea est.

From among such Essenes and Nazirites (holy men of God) and from the deserts it is easy for us to imagine John the Baptist, clothed with camel's hair and a leathern girdle, making his way to the Jordan. He wears long hair, eats locusts and wild honey, and is just such an ascetic as Pliny has pictured.[1] To him amongst others came Jesus, who also is described by Mark and Luke as a 'Holy One of God' or Nazirite (נזיר אלהים). In fact, there seems to have been a definite tradition that Jesus was really a Nazirite, in fulfilment of prophecy—the prophecy recorded in Matthew ii. 23. At the same time, however, in the actual later life of Jesus, as depicted in Matthew and Luke, we find that he was a Nazirite of a very different type from John the Baptist or any other typical Nazirite, for he was even accused by his enemies of being 'a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber'. Of this characteristic, to be sure, Mark and John appear to know nothing, but we believe Matthew and Luke to be stating a fact when they thus point out that he was not himself an *extreme* ascetic, while, on the other hand, the traditional picture of Jesus with long hair furnishes further evidence of the existence of an early tradition that he was a Nazirite.

As a very exceptional Nazirite Jesus must have appeared during the greater part of his public life. He came from Galilee, that section known as Nazara (Naṣara)

[1] Dr. Moffatt has called my attention to the following passage from the Life of Josephus, section 2, wherein is vividly described the manner of life of the Essene Banus:
'when I was informed that one whose name was Banus, lived in the desert, who used no other clothing than grew upon trees, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently, both by night and by day, in order to preserve his chastity, I became a follower of him' (Whiston's Translation revised . . ., vol. i, London, 1900, pp. 2–3, Bohn's Standard Library). Here we have truly a likeness in duplicate of John the Baptist.

of Galilee, east of the Sea of Galilee, which had already come to be, or shortly after his death was sometimes employed as, a synonym for Galilee. He must, therefore, have been familiar with the habits of the Essenes and ascetics, even if he was not one himself. Towards the end of his life, however, when he had been identified as the promised Messiah, a new title was applied to him,—a popular name, which had been first used in Isaiah xi. 1, and originally meant branch, but which had come to be employed as a synonym of Messiah, נצר or נוצר, Netser (Neṣer) or Nôtser (Nôṣer). In the Greek this word became *Νασωραῖος*, and accompanied by the definite article and under the *prophetic* form *Ναζωραῖος* is to be translated Messiah in Luke, John, and the Acts.

After Jesus' death and resurrection his followers were first called in Aramaic Nôṣri *Νασωραῖοι* (Messiah + ans). The word appears in the *Greek* New Testament in Acts as *Ναζωραῖοι*, where the Jews accuse Paul of being the leader of the sect of the *Ναζωραῖοι*, a word which has usually been translated in this place as Nazarenes.[1] What a flood of light is thrown upon the passage, however, when we translate *Ναζωραῖοι* (*Νασωραῖοι*) as Messiah + ans or Christians. For Paul admits that that description of himself is true. From the standpoint of the Jews he is indeed the leader of a Jewish Messianic sect (not a pre-Christian sect), but at the same time he is the leader of the same, or a similar group of persons, who at Antioch, a Greek-speaking city, had already been called *Χριστιανοί*. The name, too, is the same and has the same significance, for in Acts xxvi, which is closely connected in its general subject with Acts xxiv, Agrippa says (verse 28) to Paul: 'With but little persuasion thou wouldest make me a Christian', an expression which shows that Paul was a Christian at the time and had argued in favour of Christian or Messianic

[1] In reality not such an incorrect reading since Nazarenes (Naṣarenes) also evidently had, or came to have, the secondary meaning of Christians (Messiah + ans). Prof. Burkitt says that 'the Moslems call a Christian *Naṣrānī*' (*Syriac Forms . . .*, pp. 15–18).

views, although he had previously been called *Ναζωραῖος*, instead of *Χριστιανός*.

Thus we find from the Greek of *Luke*, *John*, and the *Acts* that *Ναζωραῖος* (*Νασωραῖος*) with the article means the Messiah, the Christ, or Christ; and that *Ναζωραῖος* (*Νασωραῖος*) without the article in the singular means Christian, and in the plural Christians.

This same use of the word meets us in the Aramaic or Syriac, where Nôṣri (Nôtsri) evidently means Christians (Messiah + ans), and ha-Nôṣri means the Messiah, the Christ, or Christ. The consonants of the word in the Hebrew, the Aramaic, and the Greek *Νασωραῖος* (= the *prophetic* *Ναζωραῖος*), unmistakably identify it in the three languages as the same.[1]

For the convenience of comparison later, we may now notice more particularly a few of the outstanding characteristics of these primitive Jewish Christians, of whom Paul was one. In Acts xiii. 14–15, at Antioch of Pisidia, 'they went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and sat down.' In fact, throughout the Acts they kept the sabbath days, they attended the synagogues, not with the idea of drawing the people away, but primarily of course for the purpose of worship, and secondarily no doubt in the hope of convincing

[1] The letter *tsade* (צ, *ts*, or *ṣ*) *in ancient times* was practically never rendered into Greek by any letter but sigma, and for the few exceptions known where zeta represents *tsade* some special reason is likely to be found. Even in Matthew's Gospel where the prophetic Ναζωραῖος occurs, and where the zeta was first used in the Greek New Testament in the spelling of Νασωραῖος, we find *tsade* in Chapter I twice reproduced by sigma, *viz.* in verse 3, Φαρές (פרץ, 1 Chron. ii. 5) and Ἐσρώμ (חצרון, 1 Chron. ii. 5). Nor were these words evidently reproduced from the Septuagint. The prophetic Ναζωραῖος with zeta is therefore really a word of different origin (as will be seen in Appendix VIII), which for prophetic reasons has been substituted for Νασωραῖος. Throughout *Matthew* Ναζωραῖος consistently signifies Νασωραῖος in its secondary meaning of Nazarene. Prof. Burkitt's study, mentioned in my Preface, supports this conclusion. Furthermore, *Naṣāra*, from the same root, is 'the ordinary oriental word for "Christians" to-day' (*Encyc. Brit.*, 11th ed., art. *Nazareth*).

those in attendance of the truth of their convictions, if opportunity offered. In Acts xxii. 3 Paul defends himself with the statement that he is a Jew; and in Acts xxiii. 6 with the declaration that he is 'a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees'! We may therefore safely conclude that wherever the early Jewish Christians found a synagogue to worship in and were granted the privilege, there they worshipped the same God whom the ordinary Jews worshipped.

The next point of interest concerning these early Jewish Christians is the tradition that under Christ's guidance, shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in A. D. 70, they migrated to the districts just beyond the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee, and in that neighbourhood (beyond the reach of Jewish persecution) settled down. These good people were those who were so blindly attacked at a later period as heretic Nazoræans (*Ναζωραῖοι*) and Ebionites by Epiphanius, Jerome, and other Fathers of the Church! Their chief centres of activity were Beroea, Pella, and the neighbouring regions of Decapolis, Batanaea, Bashan, &c. Here, according to Epiphanius, 'the impious Nazarenes,' inhabitants of Nazara, i. e. Naṣara (construct form Naṣarath or Naṣareth), had their beginnings. In other words, the territory named *Ναζαρά* means the Christian country, and the word Nazarenes (Naṣarenes) means the inhabitants of Naṣara, or Christians. Therefore Naṣarene eventually became the equivalent of *Ναζωραῖος*. With the writer of an article in the *Jewish Encyclopædia* I identify the Nazoræans and the Ebionites as the same group of people, the primitive Jewish Christians, and I add thereto a third body, Epiphanius' *Ναζαραῖοι*, of whom likewise he evidently knew very little. A change in the pointing (i. e. in the vowels) here has no significance.

We do not know whether the tradition that the Jewish Christians under the guidance of Jesus, just before the fall of Jerusalem, settled at Pella and in other parts of larger Galilee, which after the settlement became known as Naṣara, had anything to do with the various statements in the

Synoptic Gospels, that the disciples were to go into Galilee after the resurrection and there meet Jesus, but it does not appear to be impossible that the two traditions may in some way be related.

In Gentile countries the situation of the early Christians was very different from that in Palestine, for synagogues were not to be found in every city, and if there had been, the Gentiles would not have been welcome, unless they first became Jewish proselytes. Hence, early Christian separatist assemblies, if we may so call them, eventually arose in Gentile cities, and synagogues were formed by the Gentile Christians. These were termed ἐκκλησίαι, a Greek translation for synagogues. Thus a permanent separation ultimately resulted between the Jews together with the Jewish Messiah + ans or Christians and the Gentile Christians.

At first the latter seem to have found comparatively little fault with the former for any peculiarities they may have manifested, no doubt because their customs at first were so similar. After the separation had increased, however, misunderstandings were more liable to arise, and by the time of Justin a group of the Jewish Christians, known as Ebionites, had come to be regarded as heretics. Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen, Tertullian, and Eusebius[1] all consider them as such, though it appears to me that even Eusebius knows very little about them. The most that could be said against them was that for a certain reason their views were thought to tend towards Arianism. This reason, however, is by no means convincing, and will be considered later, when the Ebionite Gospel is discussed.

Thus far no complaint had been lodged by Western Christianity against the primitive Jewish Christians as a whole. But the time was rapidly approaching when their customs and views could no longer be understood. Fortunately, a climax was not reached until the time of Epiphanius, who condemned all the Jewish Christians, orthodox and unorthodox (Nasoræans and Ebionites), as heretics;

[1] See a note on the Ebionites in McGiffert's edition of *Eusebius*.

while the historian, Theodoret, it is said, went one step further, and declared them mere Jews!

The attitude of Epiphanius is so illuminating that it is worthy of examination. The views of these Jewish Christians are entirely beyond his comprehension, for they appear to him to be trying to be both Jews and Christians! He finds fault because they are not known by the Western name of Christians, instead of by the Oriental word which means the same thing, Nôṣri (*Ναζωραῖοι*)! He notices that the Apostle Paul admits that he belongs to this heretical *Jewish* sect, and therefore labels as *Christian* heretics a whole people of whom he has only the slightest knowledge. He says of the Naṣoræans that they use an heretical Gospel, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and that they use no other, although he admits the report that Aramaic translations of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Gospel of John are said to exist among them; he completely forgets for the time being that their Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was written in their own oriental tongue, was naturally more highly prized by them than the later Western Gentile Gospels, whether expressed in Greek or translated into Aramaic! Jerome follows in the footsteps of Epiphanius, and if we turn to his works we will find an equally remarkable description of these earliest eastern Christians in his day.[1] His title of heretics we cite for the sake of exactness, but would not otherwise employ it: '. . . What shall I say of the Ebionites, who pretend that they are Christians? Even to this day, through all the synagogues of the East among the Jews, there is a heresy

[1] Jerome's Letter to Augustine (Epistola lxxxix, according to Marianus, *Opera Omnia*, vol. ii, Parisiis, 1578, fol., col. 529):

'. . . Quid dicam de Hebionitis, qui Christianos esse se simulant? Vsque hodie per totas orientis synagogas inter Iudæos hæresis est, quæ dicitur Mineorum, & a pharisæis nunc vsque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaræos [= Ναζωραῖος] nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum, filium Dei, natum de virgine Maria; & eum dicunt esse, qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est, & resurrexit: in quem & nos credimus: sed dum volunt & Iudæi esse, & Christiani, nec Iudæi sunt, nec Christiani.'

which is even now condemned by the Pharisees and known as that of the Mineans (Minei), whom in the vulgar tongue they call Nazaræans [ = *Ναζωραῖοι*], who believe in Christ, the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary; and He they say it was who suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rose again: whom we also believe: but while they wish to be both Jews and Christians, they are neither Jews nor Christians [that is evidently because they continued to attend the Jewish Synagogues, just as the Apostles and the early Christians always did !].'

The deplorable confusion in which learned Western ecclesiastics found themselves regarding the primitive Jewish Christians, is shown perhaps even more clearly by the following passage from Jerome, in which he definitely shows that the Jews looked upon the 'impious Nazarenes' as true Christians. Unfortunately, Western scholars could not accept their verdict:

vt subaudiatur, in synagogis vestris, qui diebus ac noctibus blasphemant saluatorem: Et sub nomine, vt sæpe dixi, Nazarenorum ter in die in Christianos congerunt malidicta . . . (*Comment. on Isaiah*, lii).

Having thus briefly outlined the general course of the history of primitive Christianity from the standpoint of Judaism and the Church, we may now with profit turn our attention for a moment to the expansion of Christianity in the Greek and Roman world. We observe first that the word Messiah, which in Hebrew might also be expressed by נצר or נוצר, when translated into Greek takes the form of *Χριστός*, and if likewise translated into Latin would become *Unctus*, instead of its present form, *Christus*, derived from the Greek.

It has been said that 'the Christians did not start with a ready-made label', and that the 'title Christian . . . was a bitter nickname of Latin formation . . . invented by the wits or magistrates of Antioch . . . which may have been originally . . . and was still popularly mispronounced as

"Chrestian" as late as Tertullian',[1] &c. In the light of recent investigations this statement can hardly be entirely acceptable. The term Christians or Messiah + ans, whatever its form, was certainly an appropriate designation, and must have emanated originally from themselves. The Latin form of the name was not unnatural. *Unctus* manifestly could not be suitably employed, and *Christus* at that early period would probably have only appeared ridiculous to the Roman public. *Chrestus*, however, could be very well understood and respected as a name.[2] At a later period, when the Christian religion had been firmly established, and the name *Christus* had become familiar to the people of the whole Roman empire, the designation had ceased to appear absurd.

Turning now from this sketch of the general development of early Christianity, let us look for a moment at its earliest literature. We may appropriately begin with the

[1] Col. Owen Williams has kindly called my attention to this passage. I cite it in full:
'the Christians did not start with a ready-made label. The title Christian . . . was a bitter nickname of Latin formation . . . invented by the wits or magistrates of Antioch (inference from its Latin form), which may have been originally (Suet. *Claud.* 25, "Chresto impulsore"), and was still popularly mispronounced as "Chrestian" as late as Tertullian. Cf. Justin I. *Apol.* 4, "We are accused of being Christians, yet to hate what is Chrestian (excellent) is unjust." . . . The name at first was resented and ignored by the Christians (*e.g. Acts* xxvi 29) while to the Jews the Christians were Ναζωραῖοι. . . . The name had however caught on among the mob of Rome by 64 (Tac. *l.c.*) and was accepted by Gentile Christians by the time of Ignatius . . ., though the Christian Jews still called themselves Nazarenes, even after their retreat to Pella, and possibly still survive under that name at Bussorah (Encyc. Brit. s. v. "Mandæan") . . .' (H. B. Workman's *Persecution in the Early Church*, London [? 1906], p. 58, note.)

[2] This view has been suggested to me by Dr. Henry Bradley. It seems to suit the case exactly, and no doubt offers the best explanation of the early Latin forms that has yet been given. 'Christus' would probably have meant to the Romans, 'rubbed with oil,' as an athlete might be prepared for a contest, but of such an anointing as was prevalent among the Jews they knew nothing. 'Chrestus' would signify 'useful' or 'excellent'.

Gospel according to the Hebrews, which a good tradition reports to be the oldest of the Gospels, and the substance of which is believed to be preserved in our canonical Gospel according to Matthew. I would suggest that this *oldest* Gospel is also in reality that long-sought document, the Logia or Q, of which the critics have written so much in recent years. This point, it appears to me, may be clearly inferred by combining the testimony of the three following passages from early writers.

The first statement to be considered is that of Papias [1]:

*Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραίδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος.* (Matthew accordingly brought together and wrote out in [the] Hebrew language the words [of Jesus], and each one [? of the four canonical Evangelists] made use of (literally, interpreted) them as he was able.)

The second citation is from Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew*, xii. 13 [2]:

In euangelio, quo utuntur Nazaraeni [*Ναζαρηνοί = Ναζωραῖοι*] et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus, et quod uocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum, . . . (In the Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites, which I have lately translated into Greek from the Hebrew, and which by many is called the original of Matthew, . . .)

The third testimony is likewise from Jerome, *Contra Pelagianos*, iii. 2 [3]:

In euangelio Iuxta Hebraeos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis literis scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazaraeni [*Ναζαρηνοί = Ναζωραῖοι*], secundum apostolos siue, ut plerique autumant, iuxta Matthaeum, quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca, . . . (In the Gospel according to the Hebrews (according to the Apostles or according to Matthew, as many affirm), which is written indeed in the Aramaic and Syriac language but with Hebrew letters; which the Nazarenes [the primitive Jewish Christians] use even to this day; and [a copy of] which is kept in the library at Caesarea, . . .)

[1] As cited in Dr. E. Preuschen's *Antilegomena*, Giessen, 1901, p. 57.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 5. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

From these three passages it may reasonably be concluded that Papias and Jerome are here referring to the same work written in Aramaic, but with Hebrew characters, for the use of the Jewish Christians, and that each one of the four canonical Gospels is based more or less upon it,—a tradition, to the truth of which present evidence seems strongly to point.

As Jerome has preserved for us various important non-canonical passages from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, so Epiphanius has fortunately stored away in his Panaria a number of fairly extended citations from the Ebionite Gospel, which he considers a mutilated as well as curtailed recension of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. To him this was a work of Arian tendency, whereas it must rather have tended to support an Adoptionist view of Jesus as the Son of God. Epiphanius appears to have nothing to say against the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and, in fact, in one place cites an extended passage from it which we reproduce elsewhere.

Most of the selections from the Ebionite Gospel are given here in an Appendix, and may also be found in Preuschen and Klostermann. As we examine these excerpts carefully we quickly notice that the Ebionite Gospel is evidently not merely a mutilated Gospel according to the Hebrews, for some features in it do not appear in that work, while they are found in Luke. Furthermore, it becomes evident that the Gospel of the so-called Ebionites shows no more tendency toward Arianism than the canonical Gospel according to Mark, of which Epiphanius, in quite another part of his bulky book, speaks in very different terms. In fact, we cannot do better than to designate the Ebionite Gospel, the original Mark. In the characteristic citations from this work given by Epiphanius, while we indeed find marked differences from the text of the canonical Gospel, we also find as remarkable resemblances.

It should be noted here that the Ebionites, whom Epiphanius especially condemns because they used the Ebionite Gospel, are stated by him to live, among other

places, in a village east of the Jordan called Cochabe. Now Eusebius tells us that relatives of Jesus 'according to the flesh' lived there (Cochaba).[1] These relatives surely were not Christian heretics, but they probably were Ebionites, that is, primitive Jewish Christians. May there not, too, perhaps, be some significance in the fact that the Ebionite Gospel was employed in Cochabe or its neighbourhood, namely, because some Christians who had had a fuller knowledge of the life of Jesus, doubted the strict historicity of the story of his birth as given in the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Matthew), and for this reason had prepared another curtailed and improved recension for use in that district?

If we turn now to the citations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the original of Matthew, of which some of the more extended citations not found in our present Matthew are given in an Appendix, and of which others may be found in Preuschen[2] and Klostermann,[3] we will quickly see, even from the comparatively few non-canonical passages at present known to us, that the Gospels of Luke and John as well as Matthew (and Mark) have benefited therefrom, while Paul himself, as indicated by his first letter to the Corinthians, was evidently acquainted with it, or at least with the tradition upon which it is based. Some citations, on the other hand, do not appear to be represented in any form at all in the Greek canonical Gospels, no doubt on account of a somewhat apocryphal tone to be noticed in them, while others have as manifestly been modified to suit the tastes of Gentile readers, a fact which makes it evident that a selective process has indeed been used to some extent by the canonical writers, as Papias appears to me to suggest. Even the introductory chapters of Luke, as we now know, are based in part upon one of the sources of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, namely

[1] Eusebius, *Church History*, I. vii. 14 (ed. McGiffert).

[2] *Antilegomena*, Giessen, 1901, pp. 3–8.

[3] *Apocrypha II Evangelien*, 2d ed. (Hans Lietzmann's Kleine Texte), Bonn, 1910, pp. 4–12.

Judges xiii, with various marked alterations and improvements.

From the time when the primitive Jewish Christians came to be looked upon as heretics, the value of the literature used by them naturally began to depreciate in the West. That this changed attitude was a mistake, however, is rapidly becoming manifest, as the great value of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and of the Ebionite Gospel is coming to be better appreciated. Surely Jerome would never have cited the peculiar features of the Gospel according to the Hebrews in his Commentaries, and would never have translated it into both Greek and Latin as he did, without entertaining a high sense of its worth.

The value of these Gospels becomes further apparent, now that we have reason for thinking that the so-called Sect of the 'Nazarenes' (including therewith the Ebionites) was no *Christian Sect* at all; that the name Nazoræans (Naṣoræans) was simply the Jewish term for Christians or Messiahans, the orthodox Jewish Christians of whom the Apostle Paul was one; and that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or the tradition upon which it is based, was familiar to Paul (evidence, Jesus' appearance to James the Just which is only mentioned in the New Testament by Paul), a convincing evidence of its great age. Surely such a work ought indeed to rank with us, as with the ancients, as the earliest Christian book of which we have any record.

Nor need we be puzzled because in the complete Gospel to the Hebrews there were passages which to the Western mind have a manifestly apocryphal ring. The Gospel as a whole was evidently so like our present Gospel according to Matthew, that only some of its more outstanding characteristics are mentioned by Jerome. Of the features common to both Gospels he naturally needs to make no mention.

Having thus seen that the Gospel according to Matthew must have been practically a reproduction of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, let us turn our attention for a moment to the introductory portions of these two Gospels

of whose remarkably close resemblance we have definite evidence.[1] For convenience we will use Matthew's more complete text. In the first place, we notice that the first two chapters are based, as it were, upon a groundwork of prophecies. Chapter i begins with Jesus' Genealogy (verses 1–17). In verses 22–23 occurs the first prophecy which is definitely mentioned. The second appears in chapter ii. 5–6, the third in verse 15, the fourth in verses 17–18, the fifth in verse 23, and finally, the sixth in chapter iii. 3. Now Matthew makes occasional use of prophecy in other chapters, but not with such frequency as we find here. One seems to gain the impression that the parentage, boyhood, and early manhood of Jesus either had never been known in detail, or had been forgotten, for the most part, when this Gospel was written. In such a case how could an unfortunate gap be better supplied than by searching for the prophecies concerning the Messiah which were believed to have been fulfilled, and by employing the evidence obtained as a solid foundation of fact? In this way, it is true, the names of Jesus' mother and father could not be supplied, as well as some further details, but those might be otherwise procured.

With some such plan in mind we can imagine this Oriental writer taking up his work. It should be remembered that his view-point is decidedly different from that of his Western readers of to-day, that he is writing chiefly for his countrymen of his own time, who will for the most part find little or nothing strained or unnatural in his interpretations. Let us then scrutinize more carefully his prophecy preserved in Matt. ii. 15, 'Out of Egypt did I call my son.' This is taken from Hosea xi. 1, 'When Israel was a child then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.' Even as written in the Hebrew the application of the prophecy to Jesus seems forced to our minds, but in the Greek of the Septuagint, which was for the most part read by the early Gentile Christians, the passage presented such difficulties that it was not identified in the West, if I remember correctly, until about the time of Jerome.

[1] See Appendices.

We can be almost certain, however, that the original oriental author was quite oblivious of any strained interpretation, for in Matt. ii. 23, a few verses further on, occurs a still more baffling prophecy, which we are only now beginning to understand. Here the writer's procedure seems to have been as follows. He knows that the Christians are living, at the time he is writing, in a district of larger Galilee beyond the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee, which perhaps before, certainly after, the time of the migration from Jerusalem had come to be known as *Ναζαρά* (Naṣara; construct form Naṣareth or Naṣaret), the Christian Land, or Country of the Messiah. He seems to know further that Jesus himself had lived in this district, and probably thinks of it as thus named during Jesus' own lifetime. Accordingly, the writer mentions Naṣara as Jesus' home after the return from Egypt, a point in itself of such doubtful value in his narrative as to require the support of some prophecy to show that the Messiah was indeed to live there. But could such a prophecy be found? No, no clear one, for the word הנצר or הנוצר (ha-Nôṣri in Aramaic, *ὁ Ναζωραῖος* in the Greek) meant the Messiah. *Without* the article, however, it seems to have acquired also the secondary meaning of Naṣarene (an inhabitant of Naṣara), a term which likewise came in time to acquire the secondary connotation of Christian, the equivalent of *Ναζωραῖος* without the article. For the use both of Naṣarene and of נצר (*Ναζωραῖος*), however, as has been said, he could find no prophecy that would suit his purpose. His only course was either to omit the prophecy, or again to strain a point. He chooses the latter, employs the word נזיר (*Ναζιραῖος*) in Judges xiii. 5, or 7 ('the child shall be a Nazirite unto God from the womb to the day of his death') to stand for נצר (*Ναζωραῖος*) in its secondary sense of *Ναζαρηνός* (Nazarene), and, as usual, does not state his source. When the word נזיר (Nazir) was translated into Greek, the scribe, who was apparently acquainted with the expression נצר (*Ναζωραῖος*), intentionally or unintentionally read *vaw* (ω) for *yod* (ι), and thus produced the puzzling

designation *Ναζωραῖος*, a word which, supported by an undiscovered prophecy, has had such an influence upon succeeding scribes of the Greek New Testament, as eventually to cause all instances of the words *Νασωραῖος*, *Νασαρά* (*Νασαρέθ*, *Νασαρέτ*), and *Νασαρηνός* to be spelled with a zeta, and thus probably to give rise to the tradition that Jesus was a Nazirite, or Holy One of God.

In the Syriac versions, on the other hand, though the earliest manuscripts are at present supposed to be later than our earliest Greek manuscripts, a better knowledge of the Semitic word has fortunately been preserved. Here we do not find the semitic letter *zain* at all represented in the words standing for Naṣara (Naṣareth, Naṣaret), Naṣarene, and Naṣoræan (*Νασωραῖος*), but always the letter *tsade*, which should almost *invariably* be translated by ts or ṣ.[1] In this case, the scribes probably thought that some mistake had been made in inserting this undiscovered prophecy in Matt. ii. 23, and accordingly altered the spelling from נזר to נצריא. Thus in the Syriac we have a comparatively accurate and unforced reading, but no prophecy (strictly speaking) upon which to base it, while in the Greek we find a forced prophecy, a forced reading, and misspelled words.

Thus in part were written the introductory chapters of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and of the canonical Gospel according to Matthew, and on this account perhaps it seemed desirable to some of the primitive Jewish Christians (called Ebionites) and to the Gentile Christians to prepare other Gospels.

The most acceptable explanation of the fact that the four canonical Gospels are so divergent in form and content, is that they were written individually to suit some party within the Church, and perhaps at the same time to combat the influence of some enemy without. This, at any rate, appears to have been the ultimate cause of the production

[1] See Prof. Burkitt's article to which reference is made in the Preface.

of the Gospels according to Mark, Luke, and John, while our Matthew, which, on the whole, must have closely resembled the Gospel according to the Hebrews, was evidently prepared in order to preserve and make known the chief facts of Jesus' life, which still survived in tradition.

As far as the Gospel according to the Hebrews is concerned, since the first Christians were Jews, the first Gospel was naturally written by them and for their use. When Gentiles, however, began to be converted to Christianity, it was as natural that a Greek translation should be required by them for use in their churches. This fact resulted in the preparation of our canonical Gospel of Matthew, wherein some features of the Aramaic Gospel were omitted as not appearing quite credible or acceptable to the Western mind. The Ebionite Gospel, the original Gospel of Mark, likewise was prepared in Palestine, and was later translated and modified into approximately its canonical form.

The Gospel according to Luke was evidently written because its author was not satisfied with the canonical Gospel of Matthew, or with the canonical Gospel of Mark, or with their prototypes. This he practically says in the few introductory words to his Gospel, and we now know that that statement is true beyond our previous understanding, as we have noticed the radically different use he has made of Judges xiii. John's Gospel, also, manifests a lack of satisfaction with Luke's Gospel as well as with the earlier ones. The introductions to Matthew and Luke were neither of them perfectly acceptable, since they did not appear to agree with each other, and consequently manifested a genuine difficulty in obtaining entirely satisfactory information relating to Jesus' birth, childhood, and early manhood. On the other hand, neither did it seem desirable to introduce Jesus, the God-man, to readers as one who only became divine at His baptism, and without any further introduction, even though in Mark's pages He indeed appeared almost to follow the order of the Priesthood of Melchizedek, 'without father . . . without genealogy.' To the writer of the fourth Gospel Jesus was

a divine being in a somewhat different sense from that presented in the pages of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. John, accordingly, in order to make his view perfectly clear—a view which no doubt he believed was true, and would at the same time be acceptable to the Western world—wrote the matchless Prologue to his Gospel. This work appears to me to have been certainly the latest of the canonical Gospels, as is generally believed to be the case. In fact, it was probably intended to supersede them all. Such supreme success, however, did not result, for all of these documents rightly came to be so highly prized by the Church, or by some section or sections of it, that in later times when the Canon became settled, all four Gospels were admitted, and accordingly have been preserved, no doubt with some minor alterations, for all time, in spite of very evident divergencies both in general tone and detail. This was a providential occurrence, for we are thus enabled to sift out the truth behind the divergencies, and to bring that truth into such a form as to be acceptable to the inquiring modern mind—a result which might not have been possible had only one Gospel survived.

In closing, it should be noted that, as is well known, the texts of the canonical Gospels have been considerably altered in places since they were first written, by the addition of marginal glosses, &c. Such additions or alterations apparently were chiefly or wholly made before the time in which our earliest surviving manuscripts were written, so that almost our only hope of discovering earlier readings is from the citations of Church Fathers who lived at least as early as 400 A.D., and who did not realize what valuable critical material they were preserving in the pre-canonical citations they incorporated in their ponderous volumes. Epiphanius, among these Fathers, was a most painstaking copyist of the manuscripts used by him, whatever may be said against his work in other respects. Thus in his Panaria are contained some very interesting variant readings from our canonical Gospels, which so well illustrate the alterations that have taken place, that a number

of the most important have been here reproduced in an Appendix.

The great mistake which the Church made with regard to its early literature was to allow both of the original Aramaic Gospels, together with the painstaking translations of the first into Greek and Latin by Jerome, to be utterly lost. If the so-called heretics who used them, and whom we have sought to prove were the orthodox primitive Jewish Christians of Palestine, still have descendants in the East as is reported, may we not hope that some enterprising Western scholar will try to find among them complete copies of these long lost original texts of Matthew and Mark?

# APPENDIX I

## THE MEANING OF THE WORDS CHRIST AND CHRISTIANS

The word Christians manifestly means not followers of Jesus, but followers of [Jesus, as] the Messiah (the Anointed One) of the Jews.[1] As is well-known, in translating, Messiah, being a Hebrew word, might either be taken over bodily and transliterated into the Greek, or a Greek word meaning the same thing might be substituted for it. As a matter of fact, the two chief Hebrew expressions for Messiah were both thus transliterated, while a third Greek form Χριστός was more often employed along with occasional uses of the other two. For Christians we likewise find, beside Χριστιανοί (Christi + ans), the word Ναζωραῖοι (Ναζωραῖοι), which is also formed of Messiah (Christ[i]) + ans, and of course means the same thing. Further, it is natural that the word Christians (Χριστιανοί) should originate at Antioch and not in Jewish territory, since Greek and not Aramaic was evidently the predominant language at Antioch.

The term Ναζωραῖος in the sense of Christian naturally arose only after Christ's resurrection. Preceded by the article it means the Messiah or Christ, but this expression as is well known, was only applied to him a few times before his death, and then in general towards the end of his life. Accordingly, we find the word chiefly employed in the Acts.

Before considering various instances of its use let us examine a little more closely the Hebrew term נצר (Noṣer) from which it is derived. The word literally means branch, but was so prominently used in Isaiah xi. 1, in connexion with one of the great Messianic prophecies, that, apparently, it soon became a popular synonym for Messiah. This point is made evident

[1] Hence a contributor to *Foundations* well may ask the question: 'Had the theories of certain modern theologians been well-grounded, should we not have expected the early disciples to be known at Antioch not as *Christians* but rather as *Jesuits*?' (p. 157, note 3).

by the fact that the Targum,[1] and this is Jewish comment, paraphrases נצר as Messiah: '"And there shall go forth a king [=Messiah] from the sons of Jesse and a *Messiah* from his sons' sons . . ."' It should also be added here that as at that period Hebrew words were unpointed (i. e., without vowels), they might be variously transliterated into Greek as far as the vowels were concerned. In a Hebrew name it is the consonants that are important. From נצר (Noṣer), it seems, was derived the Greek word Ναζωραῖος, but Ναζοραῖος or Ναζαραῖος would also have been intelligible.

The evidence on which we base our statement that ὁ Ναζωραῖος (=ὁ Ναζωραῖος, as has been shown elsewhere and under what circumstances) means Messiah, may be given in a few passages as follows:

Luke, John, and the Acts employ ὁ Ναζωραῖος for ὁ Ναζωραῖος to signify the Messiah or Christ. First of all and most convincing are the words in John xix. 19, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος [Ναζωραῖος] ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, which certainly must mean 'Jesus the Messiah (or Christ), the King of the Jews', a title definite, instructive, and impressive. As Dr. E. A. Abbott[2] has pointed out without quite guessing the meaning, ὁ Ναζωραῖος must be an explanatory title of at least as great dignity as that of king, since it can appropriately have no other value. Furthermore, Jesus was manifestly put to death, not because he claimed to be the earthly King of the Jews, but because he claimed to be the Messiah, a title which indeed meant King of the Jews, but which also had an additional significance with which the Greeks and Romans may not then have been very familiar. In John xviii. 4–5, and in Luke xviii. 37, ὁ Ναζωραῖος should also be rendered the Christ or the Messiah, while in Acts xxii. 8, we obtain a much more effective reading if we translate, 'I am Jesus the Messiah (or the Christ) whom thou persecutest', and especially as Paul at the time was speaking in Aramaic to the Jews.

Attention should also be called here to one passage (Acts iv. 10) where occur the words Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου, the only instance, it is believed, of such a redun-

[1] Dr. E. A. Abbott's *Miscellanea Evangelica* (*I*), 1913, p. 7.
[2] Compare Dr. Abbott's *Miscellanea Evangelica* (*I*), 1913, p. 13. He there almost advocates the view here maintained.

dant expression in the whole New Testament, wherein a probable marginal gloss Χριστοῦ or τοῦ Ναζωραίου has crept into the text, excusable only as long as the meaning τοῦ Ναζωραίου was not understood. The redundancy of the expression 'Jesus Christ the Messiah' would be noticed at once by an educated Hellenistic Jew, but in the West the words Jesus Christ have incorrectly come to be looked upon as little more than a mere name.

Finally, we may note that in Matthew Ναζωραῖος (=Νασωραῖος) is evidently used only in its secondary meaning of Nazarene or Galilaean, one who lives in Naṣara of Galilee (cf. Mat. xxvi. 69 and 71, and Mark xiv. 67). In Mark in place, so to speak, of Matthew's Ναζωραῖος we find only Ναζαρηνός (=Νασαρηνός) which Matthew ought to have employed, but did not; while Ναζωραῖος here is likewise entirely wanting. Ναζαρηνός in Mark i. 24 has the evident sense of Nazarene, an inhabitant of Naṣara. In the second case (Mark xvi. 6) it appears to stand for Νασωραῖος. Mark i. 24 has been borrowed by Luke (iii. 24). He retains the form Ναζαρηνός and its Markan significance of Nazarene.

## APPENDIX II

### JEROME'S IMPORTANT COMMENT ON MAT. ii. 23[1]

f . . . Si fixum de scripturis posuisset exemplum, numquam diceret, quod dictum est per prophetas, sed simpliciter quod dictum est per prophetam: nunc autem pluraliter prophetas vocans, ostendit se non verba de scripturis sumpsisse, sed sensum. Nazaræus [Naziræus] sanctus interpretatur. Sanctum autem dominum futurum, omnis scriptura commemorat. Possumus & aliter dicere, quod etiam eisdem verbis iuxta Hebraicam veritatem in Esaia scriptum sit: Exiet virga de radice Iesse, & Nazaræus [Naṣoræus] de radice eius conscendet.

*Ioseph.* 17. *antiqu. cap.* 10.

נָזִיר *Num.* 6. *a.*

*Esa.* 11. *a.* נֵצֶר

[1] Marianus Victorius: 'Divi Hieronymi Stridoniensis Operum Tomvs VI . . .', Parisiis, 1579, fol.

# APPENDIX III

## THE MEANING OF NAZARETH

NAZARETH, we incline to believe, is not a village, town, or city, but a section of Palestine east of the Jordan river and the Sea of Galilee. Accordingly it formed a large section of the Tetrarchy of Galilee, and is correctly spoken of as Νασαρὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, as in Mat. xxi. 11 (Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας) and in Mark i. 9 (Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ [more correctly Νασαρὲτ] τῆς Γαλιλαίας . . . ). In Jo. i. 45 and 46 the word city is not employed with Naṣara (Ναζαρέτ). Luke iv. 16–31 is made more intelligible by this new interpretation. In Luke i. 26 and Mat. i. 23 (Westcott and Hort) Naṣara is called a city, but I find that about A. D. 400 the word was not found by Epiphanius in his text of Luke i. 26, while I suspect that the word city was not originally included in Mat. i. 23.

The word as written Ναsαρέθ and Ναsαρέτ looks much like a Hebrew construct form נצרת from נצרה (Ναsαρά), which is found once or twice at least in the New Testament. Naṣara would seem to be the preferable name, though נצרת is the only form found in the Syriac MSS. now known. From Ναsαρά we obtain the word Ναsαρηνός (Ναζαρηνός). An inhabitant of Naṣara was a Naṣarene (Nazarene), but he might also be termed a Galilaean, since Naṣara comprehended a large section of the Tetrarchy of Galilee. As has already been said, even Pliny seems to have been acquainted with this fact,[1] for Dr. Edwin A. Abbott has recently called attention to the following important words by him: 'Pliny v. 81 "Coele [Syria] habet Apameam [? Hamath] Marsya [? Massya[2]] amne divisam a *Nazerinorum*[3] tetrarchia"', i. e., of course larger Galilee. That Nazarene (Naṣarene) is equivalent to Galilaean is apparent in the denials

[1] *Miscellanea Evangelica (I)*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 1, note 2.

[2] Massyas Plain (Ebene), but not River is mentioned in the district where it seems to me this River Marsyas of Pliny ought to appear. See H. Guthe's *Bibelatlas*, Leipzig, 1911, fol.

[3] In *Latin*, the letter *tsade* (ץ) is often or generally transliterated as z.

of Peter[1] where Mark xiv. 67 and 70: 'Thou also wast with the Naṣarene (τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ), Jesus . . . for thou too art a Galilaean' is equivalent to Mat. xxvi. 69–, 'Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilaean . . .' The fact too that in Peter's second denial, as reported in Mat. xxvi. 71, where Ναζωραίου stands for Ναζαρηνοῦ, 'This [one] was with Jesus the Naṣarene (Ναζωραίου)', shows that the word Ναζωραῖος (Νασωραῖος) indeed was regarded as a synonym of Nazarene (Naṣarene). Thus likewise Galilaean came eventually to mean Christian (Epictetus, iv. 7. 2; and the Emperor Julian).

## APPENDIX IV

### CONCERNING THE BIRTHPLACE OF JESUS

An old question and one raised again by these studies relates to the birthplace of Jesus. Was he as described in the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke really born in Bethlehem, or must we look for some other place? If, according to our view, these chapters are indeed ideal and prophetic, rather than historical, we must search elsewhere.

It should first be noticed that Mark, and its prototype the Ebionite Gospel, make no mention of the birth in Bethlehem, as if the author was not satisfied that it had occurred there. John also does not refer to it directly, and when he does so indirectly in chapter vii. 40–52, he gives us such information as shakes our faith in that event to the foundation. His words are so important that they must be cited here:

'40 *Some* of the multitude therefore, when they heard these words, said, This is of a truth the prophet. 41 Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, What, doth the Christ come out of Galilee? 42 Hath not the scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was? 43 So there arose a division in the multitude because of him. . . . 52 . . . Search, and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.'

In other words, the people knew that Jesus came from Galilee, while his Davidic descent, and his birth in Bethlehem, were evidently not only unknown to the people, but could not

[1] *Miscellanea Evangelica* (*I*), pp. 5–6.

be established by any one present, even by Jesus himself. Otherwise, why the silence? The difference between prophecy and reality was here manifest. The claim of Jesus to be the Messiah rested on surer ground than human prophecy.

If then one is reluctantly compelled to abandon the view that Jesus was really born in Bethlehem, is there any indication surviving of the locality where his birth may have taken place? Yes, just a suggestion.

It has long been supposed that the star mentioned in the Messianic passage, Numbers xxiv. 17, was that seen by the Magi as reported in Mat. ii. 2 (Cruden's *Concordance*). With this view we are inclined to agree. In order to refresh our minds on the subject we may repeat the prophecy: 'There shall come forth a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel.' In other words, the star is the name of a person, of the Messiah; but the writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews takes the passage literally, and accordingly the Magi first see a heavenly body, before they find Jesus, the real Star. On the author of that Gospel, in fact, the true significance seems to have been entirely lost.

In this manner, evidently a belief came to prevail among the Jews, that a star would herald the appearance of the Messiah. Now Eusebius (*Church History* I. vii. 11 and 14) tells us that the relatives of Jesus 'according to the flesh' lived in what he indeed terms two villages of [greater] Judaea, Nazârôn (Naṣara) and Cochaba. We have already given reasons for believing that Naṣara (Nazara) meant the general territory east of the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee in which the Christians had lived for the most part since the migration from Jerusalem, and where Jesus' own early home had probably been. Côchabe (Cochaba, Cocheba, or Cochabe; Syriac כוכבא, Hebrew כוכב), on the other hand, is indeed a village and means 'Star', a remarkable name for a village in any case. Had some special heavenly body been noted over the site, or fallen near it, to give it this strange name? Or, as we may like to think, was the 'Star', the Messiah, born here or in this neighbourhood? Further, did this village of the 'Star' exist in this Messianic district of Naṣara before the beginning of the Christian era?

While we are considering these suggestions, it should be noted that this same little village was apparently the home

just before A. D. 132 of another son of 'Star', who also claimed Messianic honours as a descendant of David, a very different character from Jesus, and a great enemy of the Christians who had accepted Jesus as the Messiah; one whose family, and true name, are unknown, but whose designation, [Simon] Βαρχωχεβας, Eusebius significantly states, means a star (son of a star, or son of 'Star').[1] As one of the Encyclopaedias says, Simon's name is either derived from a person or from a place. Can a more likely source of derivation be found than this Messianic village of Cochabe?

## APPENDIX V

### THE CAUSE OF THE DIVERGENCIES IN THE INTRODUCTORY CHAPTERS OF MATTHEW AND LUKE

This problem has long caused difficulties to students, but may not these difficulties appear greater and of more importance than they really are? We have seen how the writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews (chiefly reproduced in Matthew) builds up his account of Jesus' birth and childhood upon a framework of prophecies, and how, from our Western point of view, these prophecies have sometimes appeared strained. Again we have seen how Luke takes one of Matthew's sources, Judges xiii, and puts it to much more appropriate use. We have also noted how Luke manifestly avoids the Nazarene prophecy, and yet uses the very Hebrew expression (or its Greek equivalent) which is the basis of Matthew's prophecy, as the foundation of a much more justifiable paraphrase.

Luke says in the Preface to his Gospel that he was not satisfied with the Gospels that had been prepared up to the time when he undertook the task, and we now see in a more concrete form than has hitherto been possible some of the points of which he did not approve in Matthew. If we look further, I think we shall not be mistaken if we conclude that Luke likewise did not care to incorporate certain other features

[1] See Berlin Academy of Science Edition, 306.

found in Matthew's introductory chapters, and that he accordingly altered these with a perfectly good and justifiable intent.

In the first place, he did not adopt the Matthaean genealogy. This, it will be remembered, derived Jesus' descent through Solomon, who was apparently not quite the type of king to appeal to Luke as an ideal ancestor of the Messiah. Then too Matthew's genealogy was irregular, since popular feeling had required the removal of the names of Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah from his list. Luke, therefore, prepared a new genealogy deriving the line of descent through Nathan instead of through Solomon, &c.

In the second place, as has been noted elsewhere, Luke seems to have decided that Matthew's use of Judges xiii was not appropriate in its application to Jesus. He thereupon applied it to John the Baptist, the names of whose father and mother he had found in the Ebionite Gospel, or the original of Mark. Luke retains the Virgin Birth, but with some of the details he could not agree. For instance, he did not use the word star, which seemed to indicate a planet or some remote heavenly body. He accordingly paraphrased it as 'the glory of the Lord', as if thinking of the splendour of a comet or meteor; he did not believe in the account of the visit of the Magi. To him shepherds suited the case much better. He found the prophecy relating to the calling of Jesus out of Egypt forced and unnatural, and accordingly omitted it as well as the whole story derived therefrom of Jesus' visit into Egypt, which he must have concluded to have been merely built up upon that prophecy, and which, if it had been foretold, had not been fulfilled, &c.

But one may justly inquire, if Matthew's introductory chapters appealed so little to Luke, whence came all the wealth of detail so noticeable in Luke's much more extended account? The answer again must be, chiefly from Messianic prophecies or those thought to have an appropriate Messianic bearing, the same general source from which the ideal picture of the Messianic birth in Matthew is drawn.

Luke's genealogy of Jesus' descent is evidently twice as extended as Matthew's. How can we account for that? In the main by accidental scribal reduplication. Whence the conversations of which no mention is made in Matthew, &c.?

Chiefly from Old Testament prophetic passages which have been combined into an ideal picture. It will be noticed that the proportion of Old Testament parallels is very large throughout the first two chapters, and that then, *for the most part*, they cease until the last chapters are reached, when they begin again. How does this happen? The answer seems plain. The first two chapters form an ideal setting for the rest of the Gospel. They are based upon the introduction of Matthew and further tradition, while the wording of the conversations is carefully selected from such Messianic prophecies and passages as are best adapted to give expression to the sentiments which would suitably be uttered upon the occasion of the birth of the Saviour of the world, the precise details of which could never have been known outside Jesus' own family. This point is so obvious that Luke can hardly have imagined that the perfectly familiar expressions of the Old Testament, which he places in the mouths of Mary, Elizabeth, Joseph, Zacharias, Anna and Simeon, would ever be taken for the exact words of conversations of which he could have personally known nothing.

If we accept the ideal descriptions of the Messiah's birth given in Matthew and Luke as the finest expression in poetic form of the great event they herald, we will not find them incongruous or difficult to explain; but if we will not accept them in this way we must always be faced with insurmountable difficulties. We must not only explain the strange divergencies in the accounts,[1] but also how it happens that so many parallel expressions are to be found in the best known Messianic passages of the Old Testament. Surely such parallelism as is found in Luke i and ii could never have occurred in actual conversations, but in an ideal picture designed to provide a fitting prologue to the 'good tidings' of the Gospel, the employment of these familiar words and expressions was not only justifiable but most natural and appropriate.

[1] It appears to me that these divergencies are too numerous and too great to be satisfactorily explained by any theory of textual omissions, however ingenious.

# APPENDIX VI

## THE VALUE OF EPIPHANIUS' ACCOUNTS OF THE EARLY JEWISH CHRISTIANS

In the Panaria Epiphanius has gathered some of the most valuable material relating to the early history of the Church to be found in any of the Fathers, though he has brought little critical insight to bear upon it. His results accordingly must be tested at every step, and conclusions often just the opposite of his own have to be drawn, but a careful examination of his sources and deductions ought to result in the unravelling of some of the most difficult problems relating to the history of the primitive Church.

Let us take, for instance, Panarion xxix, where he is speaking of Nasoraeans and Nazoraeans. It is now easy to see that his opinions are just the opposite of what they should have been. The word Nasoraeans (Νασωραῖοι) is manifestly derived from the same root as Nôṣri or Nôtsri (not Nôzri or Nôtzri as sometimes transliterated), the Syriac name for Christians, which itself means Christians, or Messiah + ans. However, since the New Testament (we now know incorrectly) gives the word as spelled with a zeta (Ναζωραῖοι), Epiphanius says (xxix. vi) that the sect of Nasoraeans preceded Christianity and were not acquainted with it. Apparently, what he should have said was that the Nazoraeans (= Nazirites) and Essenes (Jessenes as he styles them) preceded Christianity and formed a different sect from the Christians or Naṣoraeans whose name in the Greek New Testament, through the influence of an hitherto unidentified prophecy, is unfortunately spelled with a zeta instead of with a sigma. This error, however, is only evident in the Western tradition.

Epiphanius' remarks about the Naṣoraeans (Christians or Messiah + ans), whom, following the manner of the Greek New Testament, he calls Nazoraeans, and therefore confuses with the Nazirites, are pertinent and valuable when checked by the knowledge of this confusion. He thus says in effect that the Nazirites existed before the time of Jesus, and accordingly did

not receive their name from or through him, and that for a short period the name Essenes was used to designate the Nazirites. In mistaking the Nazirites for Christians, he follows the view which was early prevalent that Ναζωραῖος in the New Testament stood for the word Nazirite. He thinks that the Nazirites were first called Christians at Antioch, no doubt because in the Acts they are called a Jewish sect. He further refers to the fact that James the Just, Jesus' brother, was a Nazirite (Ναζιραῖος, which is translated Nazaraeus in the Latin just as is Ναζωραῖος). He also mentions that the Apostle Paul was accused in Acts xxiv of being the leader of this sect, and naïvely states that the 'holy Apostle' did not attempt to deny his connection with the Nazirites (though of course he abhorred their heresy!), but 'freely admitted' his position. And adds Epiphanius, 'Neither indeed is it strange that the Apostle confesses himself to be a Nazoraean (that is, a Nazirite, which is translated Nazarene in the Latin text), since at that time everyone called the Christians by that name, from the town Nazareth'![1] Thus we learn one of the sources of this strange confusion as to the beginnings of Christian history.

Among the many curious blunders that Epiphanius has made, none, I think, is more unaccountable than when he says (Panarion xxix. vii):

'As for those heretics indeed, concerning whom we have in a way made mention, omitting the name of Jesus, they neither call themselves Essenes, nor retain the designation of Jews, nor Christians, but style themselves [Naṣoraeans] (Latin text, Nazarenos; Greek text, Ναζωραίους) from that place-name [Nazaret] . . .'

Now we know from the very words Nazarene, Nazoraeans, Nazareth, which are all of them mentioned in the Greek Gospels, that we are here dealing with regular Jewish Christians, even though Naṣoraeans is spelt with a *ε*. This fact is entirely overlooked by Epiphanius. He even gives an extended description of them and their beliefs and still fails to see that he is describing the ordinary early Jewish Christians of Palestine. He should have known that Naṣoraeans simply means Christians, and not, as he apparently thinks, (Christian) Nazirites, who unkindly omit to make any use of Jesus'

[1] Epiphanius, Panarion xxix. vi (Latin text).

name! He even tells us where these Christian Jews live, and how they were warned by Christ himself, these so-called heretics, to flee from Jerusalem before its fall! Forgetting that what the Jews might term heresy, the early Jewish Christians under the Semitic name of Naṣoraeans would term orthodoxy, he has placed them under the ban for about fifteen hundred years! He says that they use a strange Gospel written in Aramaic but with Hebrew letters, and that they employ no other, namely those written in Greek such as were read by Gentile Christians! It does not seem to have occurred to him that many Jews, and especially the unlearned Jewish Christians, could not read Greek, and at least were likely to prefer a Gospel in their own language which an early tradition (Papias), I believe rightly, reports to be the first!

In another section (Panarion xxx) Epiphanius gives an extended description of a similar group of Christians, the Ebionites, whom he likewise terms heretics. He states that they are of Arian inclination, and use the Gospel according to the Hebrews in a mutilated and disordered form. The Ebionite Gospel, he says, shows its Arian and heretical tendency in part by omitting the introduction which is now reproduced in the Greek Gospel according to Matthew! This statement he makes in one part of his ponderous book, though in another place he speaks in quite different terms of Mark's Gospel which also omits those same introductory chapters!

To recapitulate, Epiphanius like all the early Fathers is aware of the tradition, that Ναζωραῖος in Mat. ii. 23 stands for Ναζιραῖος (Nazirite). To him Paul and his associates were first Nazirites, and the name Christians only originated at Antioch. He confuses the words Nôṣri and Nazirites, thinks of the Jewish Christians of his day as being Nazirites such as Paul first was, and forthwith labels them heretic Christians.

# APPENDIX VII

## EXCERPTS FROM EPIPHANIUS RELATING TO THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS OF HIS TIME

### 1.

Dr. Edwin A. Abbott in *Miscellanea Evangelica* (*I*), has an important note on page 1 in which he says, 'See Pliny v. 81 "Coele habet Apameam Marsya amne divisam a *Nazerinorum* tetrarchia", which suggests a field that ought to be explored by anyone entering into the question of the origin of "*Nazarene*". But it seems to have attracted very little notice . . .' Surely these are the Christians dwelling in Naṣara (Nazara) mentioned by Epiphanius in the following passages (Panaria xxix. vii; xxx. ii; and xviii. i):

xxix. vii. . . . Cæterum hæc Nazaræorum [Greek: Ναζωραίων[1]] secta in Berœensi ciuitate potissimùm viget, ad Cœlen Syriam, atque etiam in Decapoli, iuxta Pellam, & in Basanitide, in ea quæ vulgo Cocabe Hebraicè Chochabe[2] dicitur. Hinc enim post illam ab Hierosolymis secessionem, illorum initia profecta sunt, cum Pellæ Discipuli omnes habitarent, à Christo de relinquenda Hierosolymorum vrbe migrandoque præmoniti, quòd eius immineret obsidio. Qua quidem occasione factum est, vt in Peræa iis quibus diximus locis degerent. Indeque Nazaræorum [Greek: τοὺς Ναζωραίους[3] αἱρεσις . . .] Hæresis sunt deducta primordia. (Relating to the Nασωραῖοι.)

xxx. ii. . . . Sed huius factionis exordium post Hierosolymitanæ vrbis excidium cœpit. Quo tempore Christiani omnes cum in Peræa degerent, atque in vrbe Pella potissimùm, quæ in Decapolitana prouincia est, cuius extat in Euangelio mentio, prope Batanæam ac Basanitidem [From margin: *Matth.* 4. *Marc.* 5. & 7.]: cum illîc inquam domicilium collocassent, hinc Ebioni data est propagandi erroris occasio. Qui in Pago quodam Cocabe[4] in regione Carnaimorum, Arnemi & Astarotharum, & Basanitidis tractu habitare cœpit, quemadmodum vetus ad nos vsque fama pertulit. Inde igitur pessimi prædicandi dogmatis initium sumpsit, vnde & impios Nazarenos

[1] Read Nασωραίων (Christians).
[2] See note 1, p. 37.
[3] Read Nασωραίους.
[4] See note 1, p. 37.

[Greek: Ναζαρηνοί[1]] cœpisse docuimus. . . . (Relating to the Ebionites.[2])

xviii. i. Nvnc alia mihi pòst Hemerobaptistas Hæresis exponenda, quæ Naza[r]æorum [Greek: Νασαραίων] dicitur. Qui quidem vt accepimus genere Iudæi sunt, è Galaatide, & Basanitide [Bashan], ac reliquis vltra Iordanem regionibus oriundi. Quamobrem cùm hæc secta Israëlitica ex gente profecta sit, Iudæorum in omnibus dogmata complectitur, nec ab iis, quos antea commemoraui, ferè vlla in re dissidet. Nam & Circumcisionem perinde atque alii retinet; & idem Sabbatum obseruat; eademque festa celebrat. . . . Ex quo factum est, vt Iudæorum ceremonias reliquas obseruent, vtpote Iudæi: . . .[3]

[1] Read Νασαρηνοί (inhabitants of Naṣara, i. e., Christians). In Eusebius' *Church History* I. vii. 14, occurs the following interesting passage (Berlin Academy of Science ed.) '. . . δεσπόσυνοι καλούμενοι διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ σωτήριον γένος συνάφειαν ἀπό τε Ναζάρων καὶ Κωχαβα κωμῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν. . . .' Here evidently we have a reference to the New Testament Naṣara (Naṣareth), where it is called only a village instead of a city as in various references in the Gospels. Furthermore, it is described as a village in Judaea, and is mentioned along with another village Kochaba, which is known to lie east of the Jordan. From this fact we may justly infer that Ναζάρων is also supposed by Eusebius to lie in the same general district, which we interpret to be not a village or a city but that section of Galilee east of the Jordan, elsewhere known as Naṣara (Nazara) of Galilee, where the impious Naṣarenes (Nazarenes) arose, referred to by Pliny as the Tetrarchy of the Nazarenes (by which evidently he means Galilee in its wider sense as used by Josephus, Eusebius, *Church History*, ed. McGiffert, I. v. 5–6 and note; or perhaps only the north-eastern Tetrarchy of Philip, Gaulanitis, Trachonitis, Batanæa, Auranitis, and the part about Paneas. It is to be noted here that by Herod's will Peræa was assigned with Galilee to Antipas. See G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, London, 1894). Josephus (Bk. xviii. iii. 3, ed. Whiston, 1822) says: 'the tribe of Christians, so named from him [Christ], are not extinct at this day.' This statement suggests that the Jewish Christians were numerous and lived together like a tribe in a common territory (Naṣara), not in a mere village or city. Whether Naṣara may have been in the first instance the equivalent of Peræa, or of Gaulanitis, Trachonitis, Batanæa, and Auranitis; or of parts of both sections I do not know, but I presume of the latter or more northern. In any instance it formed a part of greater Galilee, and was sometimes employed as a synonym for it.

[2] From this evidence it appears that the Νασωραῖοι and the Ebionites lived in practically the same territory, and it is fair to infer that they were in general the same people, the primitive Jewish Christians.

[3] The Νασαραῖοι are mentioned again in Panarion xix (Contra Ossenes). v, and also in at least one other place. Epiphanius seems to know very little about them, as also about the Ναζωραῖοι (Νασωραῖοι). The localities in which they live seem to be very similar, and I believe them all to be one people, the primitive Jewish Christians, who may readily be termed Νασωραῖοι, Νασοραῖοι, or Νασαραῖοι in Greek according to the pleasure of the scribe and the pointing adopted by him.

2.

The way in which Epiphanius became confused with regard to the earliest name given to the Christians is illustrated by the following brief section. He says in effect, that the word Ναζωραῖοι, which we will spell Νασωραῖοι for the sake of exactness, is only another name for Christians, or for Christianity, used for a brief time both by the Jews and the Apostles, before the title of Christians was first employed ; and that there was also a sect (or heresy) of Ναζωραῖοι (Νασωραῖοι) of which he will speak later ! This section follows Haeresis xx (Adversus Herodianos), and is so important for our purposes that I cite both the Greek and the Latin text in full. The Sect and the regular Jewish Christians were of course the same people.

ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΩΝ, ὅ ἐστι Χριστιανῶν ὁ κληθεὶς ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων Χριστιανισμὸς, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων, λέγοντος Πέτρου· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς· ὕστερον δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας ἀρξάμενος καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανισμός. ἔστι δὲ καὶ φύσει αἵρεσις Ναζωραίων, περὶ ὧν καθεξῆς λέξομεν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀκολουθίας.

NAZARÆORVM siue Christianorum est qui à Iudæis breui interiecto tempore vocatus est Christianismus, & ab ipsis adeò Apostolis id nomen obtinuit, cum ita Petrus locutus sit, *Iesum Nazarenum virum probatum à Deo*, &c. [Margin : *Act.* ii. 22.] Postea vero Antiochiæ Christianismus appellari cœpit. Est & alia propriè Nazaræorum secta de quibus suo loco disputabimus.

3.[1]

i. . . . Eadem enim vt diximus ætate vixerunt [Nazaræi (Ναζωραῖοι)], & in iisdem dogmatibus sunt opinionibusque versati. Atque illi quidem non à Christo, neque ab Iesu nomen acceperunt, sed se Nazaræos [Greek : Ναζωραίων[2]] appellarunt. Siquidem Christiani tum omnes Nazaræi [Ναζωραῖοι[3]] vocabantur. Quanquam pro exiguo tempore Iessæorum penes illos nomen resedit, antequam Christiani Antiochiæ nominari cœperint. Ac Iessæi, vt opinor, ab Iesse [Jesse] vocati sunt. Dauid enim Iesse filius erat, à quo generis continuata serie Maria prodiit ; . . .[4]

[1] Panarion xxix. i, iv.
[2] Read Ναζιραίων.
[3] Read Νασωραῖοι.
[4] Epiphanius draws a good deal on his imagination in this account.

iv. Hic enim Iosephi ex aliâ fuit quam Maria coniuge filius . . . Quinetiam è Dauidis genere propagatum illum reperimus, vtpotè Iosephi filium, eundemque Nazaræum [Greek: Ναζιραῖον]. Nam Iosephi liberorum hic primus, ac consecratus [ἡγιασμένος] fuit. . . . Sed multa de ea re disputari possunt. Quoniam vero ad eum locum delapsi sumus, vt reddenda caussa nobis esset, cur ij qui Christo nomen dederant, priusquam Christianorum nomen essent adepti, Iessæi vocarentur,[1] idcirco monuimus Iessæum Dauidis patrem fuisse.

4.[2]

vi. Sed alij Nazaræos [Greek: Νασαραίους or Νασοραίους[3]] seipsos appellant. Quippe Nazaræorum [Νασαραίων[4]] secta Christum antecessit, nec eum cognouit.[5] Verum Christiani, vt initio monui, ab omnibus Nazaræi [Greek: Ναζωραίους[6]] nuncupati sunt, quemadmodum illi dixerunt, qui Paulum Apostolum accusarunt: *Hunc*, inquiunt, *hominem inuenimus pestiferum, & corrumpentem populum, & auctorem sectæ Nazarenorum* [Greek: Ναζωραίων[7]] [Margin: Act. 24]. At sanctus Apostolus neque nomen istud eiurat, tametsi ab illorum Hæresi abhorreret, & quod sibi aduersariorum improbitate propter Christum impositum erat vocabulum, libenter admisit. Ita enim ante Tribunal dixit: . . . *Confiteor autem hoc tibi, quòd secundum sectam, quam dicunt Hæresin, sic deservio: credens omnibus quæ in lege, & Prophetis scripta sunt* [Margin: Act. 24]. Neque vero mirum est, Apostolum semetipsum Nazarenum [= נצריא, or Naṣarenum] confiteri, cum vniuersi tunc eo nomine Christianos vocarent, ab oppido Nazaret [= a Naṣaret, נצרת]: nec vllus alterius esset vocis vsus illis temporibus, qua eos qui Christo nomen dederant possent exprimere. De quo sanè scriptum est, *quoniam Nazarenus* [= Naṣarenus, נצריא, not Ναζωραῖος, נזיר, as in the Greek text] *vocabitur* [Margin: *Matt.* 2]. . . .

vii. Quòd vero ad Hæreticos illos attinet, de quibus modò sermonem instituimus, omisso Iesu nomine, neque Iessæos

[1] Here Epiphanius is evidently thinking of the Nazirites, whom he has confused with the Christians.
[2] Panarion xxix. vi, vii, ix.
[3] Here Νασαραίους or Νασοραίους should be altered to Ναζιραίους.
[4] Ναζωραίων.
[5] Jesus does not appear to have been a Nazirite.
[6] Read Νασωραίους. [7] Read Νασωραίων.

seipsos vocant, neque Iudæorum vocabulum retinent, neque se Christianos, sed Nazarenos [= Naṣarenos[1]] de illa loci appellatione [Greek: Ναζαρέτ] nuncupant, cum interim meri ipsi Iudæi, neque aliud præterea sint . . .

ix. . . . Est vero penes illos Euangelium secundum Matthæum, Hebraicè scriptum, & quidem absolutissimum. Hoc enim certissimè, provt Hebraicis literis initiò scriptum est, in hodiernum tempus vsque conseruant. Verum illud nescio; num Genealogias illas amputarint, quæ ab Abraamo ad Christum vsque perductæ sunt . . .

5.[2]

iii. . . . Etenim verè illud affirmare possumus, vnum ex omnibus noui Testamenti scriptoribus Matthæum Hebraicè, ac literis Hebraicis Euangelicam historiam texuisse. Nec defuere qui de Ioannis Euangelio confirmarent, illud Hebraicè translatum Tiberiade in Iudęorum Gazophylaciis asseruari, & in secretioribus quibusdam penetralibus recondi: id quod nonnulli mihi, qui se ad Christi fidem è Iudaismo transtulerant, accuratissimè declararunt. Imo & Apostolorum Actus in Hebraicum sermonem perinde conuersos è Græco iisdem in Thesauris haberi multorum sermone percrebuit: & qui nobis ista narrabant indidem Christianæ amplectendæ fidei occasionem acceperunt.

vi. . . . Per idem tempus Iosephi [non historiæ illius Scriptoris antiqui, sed Tiberiadensis alterius] animum sollicitum habebat eorum recordatio, quæ in Baptismo fieri Mystica arcanaque viderat: & quidnam ageret anxiè cogitabat. Commodum illîc Gazophylacij cella quædam erat obsignata (Gaza porrò Hebraicè Thesaurum significat). Cuius sigilli gratia plerisque varia de eo Gazophylacio suspicantibus, Iosephus clam ausus aperire nihil pecuniarum reperit, sed libros duntaxat pecuniis omnibus præstantiores. Quos dum euoluit, fortè in illud incidit, de quo dictum est, Ioannis Euangelium è Græco in Hebraicum translatum, vnà cum Apostolorum Actibus. Ad hæc Matthæi quoque Hebraicam Genealogiam inuenit. Quibus

[1] Derived from Naṣara, i. e., an inhabitant of Naṣara, the Christian territory.

[2] Panarion xxx (Ebionæi), iii (at the end), vi, xi; Latin translation.

perlectis, rursus eius animus cruciari cœpit: & Christianam quidem fidem capessere molestum si videbatur: . . .

xi. . . . [at end]. Ille [Iosephus] nihil aliud nisi hoc vnum maximi beneficij loco postulavit, sibi vt in Iudæorum pagis omnibus & oppidis extruendarum in Christi honorem Ecclesiarum potestas Imperatoris edicto fieret. Quibus in locis nemo vnquam Ecclesias[1] ædificare potuerat; quod nullus inter eos neque Gentilis, neque Samaritanus, neque Christianus[2] habitaret. Præsertimque Tiberiade, Diocæsareæ, quæ & Sephurim dicitur, Nazareti, Capharnaümi, vbi diligenter hoc obseruant, nemo vt gentis alterius domicilium illîc habeat.

## APPENDIX VIII

### THE SOURCE OF THE PROPHECY THAT JESUS SHOULD BE CALLED A NAZARENE

Even in the time of Epiphanius and Jerome, as has already been stated in the Preface, learned ecclesiastics were working over this problem. Scholars, in fact, are still discussing it, and have as nearly discovered it as possible without doing so. Even Mr. F. C. Conybeare[3] has called attention to the value of the passage of which I desire to speak, in relation to the introduction to Luke's Gospel, without however noticing that the same passage is also that which the original writer of the Gospel according to the Hebrews must have had before him when he penned those puzzling words now incorporated in Matthew ii. 23. However, no one seems to have noticed this point, and I now venture to suggest the passage as the only one in the Bible which enables us to solve the various baffling questions relating to this prophecy. How these eminent critics and theologians could have missed this point it is difficult to understand, unless it was because the solution was too simple and was to be found in such an unexpected place.

[1] The primitive Jewish Christians did not build separate synagogues for themselves, they attended the regular Jewish synagogues. No Western Christian churches had been necessary.

[2] Here Epiphanius must mean a Greek or Western Χριστιανός, not a Nôṣri or Jewish Christian.

[3] *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, London, 1909, p. 201.

The passage to which reference is made is Judges xiii. 2–24, describing the miraculous birth of Samson. There are words in it that are strikingly familiar. These fixed my attention as I was rapidly turning the pages in search of quite other philological data. I looked again and saw more familiar words, and these led me to compare the chapter with the introductory pages of Matthew and Luke. The result given below will speak for itself:[1]

| Judges. | Matthew. | Luke. |
|---|---|---|
| xiii. 2 And there was a certain man of Zorah, of the family of the Danites, whose name was Manoah; and his wife was barren, and bare not. 3 And the angel of {the Lord / Jehovah} appeared unto the woman, and said unto her, Behold now, thou art barren, and bearest not; but thou shalt conceive, and bear a son. 4 Now therefore beware, I pray thee, and drink no wine nor strong drink, and eat not any unclean thing: 5 for, lo, thou shalt conceive, and bear a son; and no razor shall come upon his head; for the child shall be a Nazirite (Hebr. נְזִיר אֱלֹהִים; Greek ναζεὶρ θεοῦ) unto God from the womb: and he shall begin to save Israel out of the hand of the Philistines. 6 Then the woman came and told her husband, saying, A man of God came unto me, and his countenance was like | [i.] 20 . . . an angel of the Lord appeared unto him . . . saying . . . that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit [= נזיר, ἅγιος, or sanctus]. 21 And she shall bring forth a son; | [i.] 5 There was . . . a certain priest named Zacharias, . . . 7 And they had no child, because that Elizabeth was barren, . . . 11 And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord . . . 13 . . . [and] said unto him, . . . thy wife Elizabeth shall bear thee a son, . . . 15 . . . and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink; |
| | [ii.] 23 and [Joseph] came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophets, that he should be called a Nazarene (Greek, Ναζωραῖος). [i.] 21 . . . for it is he | and he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb. 16 And many of the children of Israel shall he turn unto the Lord their God. |

[1] The text here employed is taken from the American Revised Version, as in general throughout these pages.

Judges.

the countenance of the angel of God, very terrible; and I asked him not whence he was, neither told he me his name: 7 but he said unto me, Behold, thou shalt conceive, and bear a son; and now drink no wine nor strong drink, and eat not any unclean thing; for the child shall be {holy, a holy one / a Nazirite} unto God from the womb to the day of his death.

8 Then Manoah entreated Jehovah, and said, Oh, Lord, I pray thee, let the man of God whom thou didst send come again unto us, and teach us what we shall do unto the child that shall be born. 9 And God hearkened to the voice of Manoah: and the angel of God came again unto the woman as she sat in the field: but Manoah her husband was not with her. 10 And the woman made haste, and ran, and told her husband, and said unto him, Behold, the man hath appeared unto me, that came unto me the *other* day. 11 And Manoah arose, and went after his wife, and came to the man, and said unto him, Art thou the man that spakest unto the woman? And he said, I am. 12 And

Matthew.

that shall save his people from their sins.

Luke.

[i.] 18 And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years.

| Judges. | Matthew. | Luke. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Manoah said, Now let thy words come to pass: what shall be the ordering of the child, and *how* shall we do unto him? 13 And the angel of Jehovah said unto Manoah, Of all that I said unto the woman let her beware. 14 She may not eat of anything that cometh of the vine, neither let her drink wine or strong drink, nor eat any unclean thing; all that I commanded her let her observe. 15 And Manoah said unto the angel of Jehovah, I pray thee, let us detain thee, that we may make ready a kid for thee. 16 And the angel of Jehovah said unto Manoah, Though thou detain me, I will not eat of thy bread; and if thou wilt make ready a burnt-offering, thou must offer it unto Jehovah. For Manoah knew not that he was the angel of Jehovah. 17 And Manoah said unto the angel of Jehovah, What is thy name, that, when thy words come to pass, we may do thee honour? 18 And the angel of Jehovah said unto him, Wherefore askest thou after my name, seeing it is wonderful? 19 So Manoah took the kid with the meal-offering, and offered it upon the rock | | 19 And the angel answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; . . . |

| Judges. | Matthew. | Luke. |
|---|---|---|
| unto Jehovah: and *the angel* did wondrously; and Manoah and his wife looked on. 20 For it came to pass, when the flame went up toward heaven from off the altar, that the angel of Jehovah ascended in the flame of the altar: and Manoah and his wife looked on; and they fell on their faces to the ground.<br>21 But the angel of Jehovah did no more appear to Manoah or to his wife. Then Manoah knew that he was the angel of Jehovah. 22 And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God. 23 But his wife said unto him, If Jehovah were pleased to kill us, he would not have received a burnt-offering, and a meal-offering at our hand, neither would he have showed us all these things, nor would at this time have told such things as these. 24 And the woman bare a son, and called his name Samson: and the child grew, and Jehovah blessed him. | [i.] 25 . . . she . . . brought forth a son: and he called his name Jesus. | [i.] 57 Now Elizabeth's time was fulfilled . . . and she brought forth a son.<br>80 And the child [John] grew, and waxed strong in spirit,<br>[ii.] 40 And the child [Jesus] grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him. |

From the book of Numbers (chapter vi) we learn the customs of the Nazirites. Among these we find the following in verses 2–5:

2 . . . When either man or woman shall make a special vow, the vow of a Nazirite, to separate himself unto Jehovah, 3 he shall separate himself from wine and strong drink; he shall drink no vinegar of wine, or vinegar of strong drink, neither shall he drink any juice of grapes, nor eat fresh grapes or dried. 4 All the days of his separation shall he eat nothing that is made of the grape-vine, from the kernels even to the husk.

5 All the days of his vow of separation there shall no razor come upon his head: until the days be fulfilled, in which he separateth himself unto Jehovah, he shall be holy; he shall let the locks of the hair of his head grow long.

The above comparison has shown that the likeness between Judges xiii and Luke i is so great as to preclude any reasonable doubt in that case. Matthew's use of this source is more sparing, but appears to be as certain. Furthermore, it has been noticed by scholars that Matthew and Luke very frequently use the same sources, but often in very independent ways. The case of the birth stories in Matthew and Luke is in other respects notably in point as is well known, and in the employment of Judges xiii, they are quite as independent of each other. Matthew's reference is not only more sparing, but is applied by him to Jesus. Luke on the other hand, as if not satisfied with Matthew, cites several striking phrases, and applies them chiefly not to Jesus, but to John the Baptist —a course which seems far more reasonable.

The view here advanced offers very little difficulty. The word Ναζωραῖος by which נזיר is translated in Matthew, as mentioned elsewhere, presupposes the use of the Hebrew unpointed text in which *yod* was naturally mistaken by the translator for *vaw*. The word accordingly, *in this instance*, is certainly a translation of נזיר, and really stands for Nazirite, whereas the sense of the passage requires it to be read Naṣarene (Nazarene), the secondary meaning of Ναζωραῖος.

# APPENDIX IX

WHATEVER may have been Epiphanius' faults in other ways, he is certainly in general a most accurate and painstaking transcriber of the textual readings reproduced in his great book. In fact, his very lack of insight makes his transcriptions all the more valuable, because he is unconscious of the use to which his testimonies may some time be put, and because his method of citation shows that in his opinion, the texts he employs do not vary to any extent from those generally in use in his day. Unless otherwise indicated, the edition of Epiphanius here employed is always that of Dionysius Petavius, which was published in two folio volumes at Paris in 1622. The edition of Jerome's works here cited is always that of Marianus.

## SELECTED CITATIONS FROM THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS WITH PARALLELS

| Matt. i. 18–ii. 2, &c. (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion li. 5. |
|---|---|
| Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυεὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. | 5. . . . καὶ οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ Ματθαῖος Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι γράφει τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ κηρύττει· καὶ ἄρχεται οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ διηγεῖται μὲν τὴν γενεαλογίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ. Ἀβραὰμ, φησὶν, ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαάκ· Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἐγέννησε[1] τὸν Ἰακὼβ, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς, ἄχρι τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας. καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τάττει, λέγων· Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαβίδ. εἶτά φησιν, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. εἶτα ἐλθὼν ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸ ζητούμενον, φησί· τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις οὕτως ἦν· μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσὴφ, πρὶν ἢ [D.'s text] συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς, εὑρέθη[2] ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου. καὶ Ἰωσὴφ |
| Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυεὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ, Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰακώβ, . . . Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, . . . ΤΟΥ ΔΕ ⌜[ΙΗΣΟΥ] ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ⌝ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν. Μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου. Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, δίκαιος ὢν καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι, ἐβουλήθη λάθρᾳ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος, ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος Κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ λέγων Ἰωσὴφ υἱὸς Δαυείδ, μὴ φοβηθῇς παραλαβεῖν ⌜Μαρίαν⌝ τὴν γυναῖκά σου, τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ | |

[1] Dindorfius has καὶ Ἰσαάκ.

[2] Dindorfius has ηὑρέθη.

Matthew.

γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου· τέξεται δὲ υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·

. . . Ἐγερθεὶς δὲ [ὁ] Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου ἐποίησεν ὡς προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου καὶ παρέλαβεν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ· καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως [οὗ] ἔτεκεν υἱόν· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.

Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐν ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἰδοὺ μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ. . . .

Epiphanius.

δίκαιος ὤν, ἐζήτει ἀπολύσαι[1] αὐτὴν λάθρα. καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐφάνη αὐτῷ κατ' ὄναρ, λέγων· μὴ ἀπολύσῃς τὴν γυναῖκά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ[2] ἐκ Πνεύματός ἐστιν ἁγίου.[3] ἰδοὺ γὰρ γεννήσει υἱὸν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· οὗτος σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἁμαρτιῶν. καὶ τοῦτο, φησὶ, γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ Προφήτου, λέγοντος· ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. καὶ ἐγερθεὶς, φησὶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου, ἐποίησεν οὕτως ὁ Ἰωσήφ. καὶ παρέλαβε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν, ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος, φησὶ,[4] ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἐν ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἰδοὺ Μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, λέγοντες· ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἴδομεν γὰρ τὸν ἀστέρα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ. . . .

Jerome, Liber de Viris Illustribus.

MATTHÆVS, qui & Leui, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Iudæa propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, Evangelium Christi Hebraicis litteris verbisque composuit. quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur vsque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus martyr studiosissime confecit.

[1] Dindorfius has ἀπολῦσαι. [2] At this point Dindorfius has γεννηθέν.
[3] Dindorfius reads ἁγίου ἐστίν. [4] Dindorfius omits φησί.

Matthew.

ii. 15 . . . Ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου.

ii. 23 . . . ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.

Jerome's Comment on Matt.

mihi quoque a Nazarẹis, qui in Berœa, vrbe Syriæ, hoc volumine vtuntur, describendi facultas fuit. In quo animaduertendum, quod vbicumque euangelista, siue ex persona sua, siue ex persona Domini saluatoris, veteris scripturæ testimoniis vtitur, non sequatur Septuaginta translatorum auctoritatem, sed Hebraicam, e quibus illa duo sunt: Ex Ægypto vocaui filium meum. Et: Quoniam Nazaræus vocabitur.

Matt. xviii. 21–2 (Westcott and Hort).

Τότε προσελθὼν ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] Κύριε, ποσάκις ἁμαρτήσει εἰς ἐμὲ ὁ ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτῷ; ἕως ἑπτάκις; λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Οὐ λέγω σοι ἕως ἑπτάκις ἀλλὰ ἕως ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά.

Jerome. Dialog. adver. Pelagianos liber tertius.

. . . In euangelio iuxta Hebræos, quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, quo vtuntur vsque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, siue, vt plerique autumant, iuxta Matthæum, quod & in Cæsariensi habetur bibliotheca, narrat historia: Ecce mater Domini, & fratres eius dicebant ei: Ioannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus, & baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccaui, vt vadam, & baptizer ab eo? Nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est. Et in eodem volumine: Si peccauerit, inquit, frater tuus in verbo, & satis tibi fecerit, septies in die suscipe eum. Dixit illi Simon discipulus eius: Septies in die? Respondit Dominus, & dixit ei: Etiam ego dico tibi, vsque septuagies septies. Etenim in prophetis quoque, postquam vncti sunt Spiritu sancto, inuentus est sermo peccati.

Matt. xxvi. 26–9 (Westcott and Hort).

. . . λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ . . . δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν Λάβετε φάγετε, . . . καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον . . . ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς . . . λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου.

Luke xxii. 15–18 (Westcott and Hort).

. . . Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. . . . λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. . . .

Jerome. Liber de Viris Illustribus. Prooemium.

. . . Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem seruo sacerdotis, iuit ad Iacobum, & apparuit ei. iurauerat enim Iacobus, se non comesturum panem ab illa hora, qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a mortuis. Rursusque post paulum, Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam, & panem. Statimque additur, Tulit panem, & benedixit, ac fregit, & dedit Iacobo Iusto, & dixit ei: Frater mi comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit filius hominis a dormientibus.[1]

Jerome. Commentary upon Matthew (chapter xii).

g *Tunc ait homini, extende manum tuam &c.*] In euangelio, quo vtuntur Nazareni & Ebionitæ (quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus, & quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi autenticum) homo iste qui aridam habet manum, cœmentarius scribitur, istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans: Cœmentarius eram, manibus victum quæritans: precor te Iesu, vt mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos. Vsque ad aduentum saluatoris arida manus in synagoga fuit Iudæorum, & dei opera non fiebant in ea: postquam ille venit in terras, reddita est in apostolis credentibus dextera, & operi pristino restituta.

Jerome. Commentary upon Matthew. Prooemium.

. . . *Primus omnium Matthæus est publicanus, cognomento Leui, qui euangelium in Iudæa Hebræo sermone edidit, ob eorum*

[1] Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 7.

*vel maxime causam, qui in Iesum crediderant ex Iudæis, & nequaquam legis vmbram, succedente euangelij veritate, seruabant . . .*

Jerome. Commentary upon Matthew (chapter vi).

. . . In euangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebræos pro supersubstantiali pane reperi מָחָר quod dicitur crastinum, vt sit sensus; panem nostrum crastinum, idest, futurum da nobis hodie . . . .

Jerome. Commentary upon Ezechiel (chapter xviii).

. . . Et in euangelio quod iuxta Hebræos Nazaræi legere consueuerunt: inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris sui spiritum contristauerit. . . . .

Jerome. Liber de Viris Illustribus (Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, p. 8).

Ego uero et post resurrectionem in carne eum uidi et credo, quia sit; et quando uenit ad Petrum et ad eos qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis: *Ecce palpate me et uidete, quia non sum daemonium incorporale. Et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt.*

Luke xxiv. 39–41 (Westcott and Hort).

*ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός· ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα. . . . Ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων. . . .*

## SELECTED CITATIONS FROM THE EBIONITE GOSPEL WITH PARALLELS

Epiphanius on the Gospel of Mark, &c. Panarion li. 6.

Εὐθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὸν Ματθαῖον ἀκόλουθος γενόμενος ὁ Μάρκος τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἐκθέσθαι· καὶ γράψας ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώραν. οὗτος δὲ εἷς ἐτύγχανεν ἐκ τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δύο τῶν Διασκορπισθέντων ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι, ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· ἐὰν μή τίς μου φάγῃ[1] τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίῃ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος, ὡς

Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 13–14.

Ἐπάνειμι δὲ τὴν κατὰ Ἐβίωνος ποιούμενος ἀκολουθίαν. διὰ γὰρ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον προϊὼν ὁ λόγος τὴν ἀκολουθίαν[2] τῆς εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐλθούσης γνώσεως παραθέσθαι ἠνάγκασεν. ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληρεστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ, καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ, Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν, ἐμφερέρεται, ὅτι ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ιησοῦς, ...

[1] Dindorfius reads φάγῃ μου.

[2] Dindorfius has ἱστορίαν.

### Panarion li.

τοῖς τὰ Εὐαγγέλια ἀναγνοῦσι σαφὴς ἡ παράστασις. ὅμως διὰ Πέτρου ἀνακάμψας εὐαγγελίζεσθαι καταξιοῦται, Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἐμπεφορημένος. ἄρχεται δὲ κηρύττειν, ὅθεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ παρεκελεύσατο, τὴν ἀρχὴν τάττων ἀπὸ πεντεκαιδεκάτου ἔτους Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, μετὰ ἔτη τριάκοντα τῆς τοῦ Ματθαίου πραγματείας. δευτέρου δὲ γενομένου Εὐαγγελιστοῦ, καὶ μὴ περὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν καταγωγῆς [Dindorf. τοῦ] Θεοῦ Λόγου τηλαυγῶς σημαίναντος· ἀλλὰ πάντη μὲν ἐμφαντικῶς, οὐ μὴν κατὰ ἀκριβολογίαν τοσαύτην, γέγονε τοῖς προειρημένοις [Dindorf. adds ἠπατημένοις], εἰς δεύτερον σκότωσιν[1] τῶν διανοημάτων, τοῦ μὴ καταξιωθῆναι πρὸς φωτισμὸν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, λεγόντων αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἰδοὺ[2] δεύτερον Εὐαγγέλιον περὶ Χριστοῦ σημαῖνον, καὶ οὐδαμοῦ ἄνωθεν λέγων[3] τὴν γέννησιν· ἀλλὰ, φησὶν, ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ κατῆλθε[4] τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ φωνὴ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς[5] ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐφ' ὃν ηὐδόκησα.

### Panarion xxx.

Ὅρα δὲ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς παραπεποιημένην πανταχόθεν διδασκαλίαν,[6] πῶς πάντα χωλὰ, λοξὰ, καὶ οὐδεμίαν ὀρθότητα ἔχοντα. ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κήρινθος καὶ Καρποκρᾶς τῷ αὐτῷ χρώμενοι δῆθεν παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγελίου, διὰ τῆς γενεαλογίας βούλονται παριστᾶν ἐκ σπέρματος Ἰωσὴφ καὶ Μαρίας εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν. οὗτοι δὲ ἄλλά τινα[7] διανοοῦνται. παρακόψαντες γὰρ τὰς παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ γενεαλογίας, ἄρχονται τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, ὡς προεῖπον,[8] λέγοντες· . . .

The beginning of the Ebionite Gospel was evidently related closely to Luke:

| | Sect. xiii. | Sect. xiv. |
|---|---|---|
| Luke i. 5 Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἱερεύς τις ὀνόματι Ζαχαρίας . . . καὶ γυνὴ αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρών, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἐλεισάβετ. | . . . ἡ δὲ ἀρχὴ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίου ἔχει. ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου τοῦ Βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἦλθεν Ἰωάννης βαπτί- | . . . ὅτι ἐγένετό φησιν, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπὶ Ἀρχιερέως Καϊάφα, ἦλθέτις Ἰωάννης ὀνόματι βαπτί- |
| Luke iii. 2 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἅννα καὶ Καιάφα, ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάνην τὸν Ζαχαρίου . . . 3 καὶ | | |

[1] Dindorfius reads σκότωσις.
[2] Dindorfius adds καί.
[3] Dindorfius omits λέγων.
[4] Dindorfius reads κατῆλθεν.
[5] Dindorfius adds μου.
[6] Dindorfius reads διδασκαλίαν πανταχόθεν.
[7] Dindorfius reads ἄλλα τινὰ.
[8] Dindorfius has προείπομεν.

| Luke. | Sect. xiii. | Sect. xiv. |
|---|---|---|
| ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας . . . 21 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν . . . | ζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, ὃς ἐλέγετο εἶναι ἐκ γένους Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, παῖς Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἐλισάβετ, καὶ ἐξήρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντες. | ζων βάπτισμα μετανοίας ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ Ἰορδάνῃ,[1] . . . |

## Matthew iii. 13–17 (Westcott and Hort).

Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάνην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ διεκώλυεν αὐτὸν λέγων Ἐγὼ χρείαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρός με; ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν ⌜αὐτῷ⌝ Ἄφες ἄρτι, οὕτω γὰρ πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην. τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν. βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεῴχθησαν ⌜ οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν· καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός ⌜μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν⌝ ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

## Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 13.

. . . καὶ μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν πολλὰ, ἐπιφέρει, ὅτι τοῦ λαοῦ βαπτισθέντος, ἦλθε καὶ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου. καὶ ὡς ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ, καὶ εἶδε[2] τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ[3] τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσα· σύ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα. καὶ πάλιν, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. ὃν ἰδών, φησι,[4] ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ τίς εἶ Κύριε; καὶ πάλιν φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐφ' ὃν ηὐδόκησα. καὶ τότε, φησὶν, ὁ Ἰωάννης προσπεσὼν αὐτῷ ἔλεγε· δέομαί σου Κύριε, σύ με βάπτισον. ὁ δὲ ἐκώλυεν αὐτῷ,[5] λέγων. ἄφες, ὅτι οὕτως ἐστὶ πρέπον πληρωθῆναι πάντα.[6]

[1] Dindorfius reads τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ.
[2] Dindorfius has εἶδεν.
[3] Dindorfius omits τοῦ Θεοῦ.
[4] Dindorfius has φησίν.
[5] Dindorfius reads ἐκώλυσεν αὐτόν.
[6] None of the canonical Gospels quite reproduce this passage, but Matthew's text perhaps resembles it most.

**Matt. iii. 4–7 (Westcott and Hort).**

Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάνης εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, ἡ δὲ τροφὴ ἦν αὐτοῦ ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον. Τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἰεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ . . . Ἰδὼν δὲ πολλοὺς τῶν Φαρισαίων . . . ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα . . .

**Mark i. 5–6 (Westcott and Hort).**

. . . 5 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμεῖται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ . . . καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάνης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσθων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον.

**Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 13.**

καὶ ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων, καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἶχεν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου, καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ. καὶ τὸ βρῶμα αὐτοῦ, φησί, μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ Μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ· ἵνα δῆθεν μεταστρέψωσι τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας[1] λόγον εἰς ψεῦδος, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀκρίδων ποιήσωσιν ἐγκρίδας ἐν μέλιτι.

**Epiphanius's Text of Luke iii. 23.**

ὅτι ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα . . .

**Luke iii. 23 (Westcott and Hort).**

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, . . .

[Cf. Matt. x. 2–4; Mark iii. 14–19; Luke vi. 14–16; and Acts i. 13.]

**Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 13.**

. . . ἐγένετό τις ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὃς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς. καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Πέτρου, καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἶπε παρερχόμενος παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάνην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν καὶ Θαδδαῖον καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν ζηλωτὴν καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ἠκολούθησάς μοι. ὑμᾶς οὖν βούλομαι εἶναι δεκαδύο[2] ἀποστόλους εἰς μαρτύριον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.[3]

[1] Dindorfius has τῆς ἀληθείας τὸν in place of τὸν τῆς . . .

[2] It should be noticed that this word is not δώδεκα as occurs in the canonical Gospels. If δεκαδύο means eight (ten minus two) instead of twelve (ten plus two), the account is consistent, otherwise not. May this passage not help to solve the problem of the varying lists of the apostles' names?

[3] According to the text of Dindorfius, with the omission of his quotation marks.

**Mark iii. 32–5 (Westcott and Hort).**

... Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ⊤ ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει . . . ⊤Ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου· ὃς ⊤ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα [Margin : τὰ θελήματα] τοῦ θεοῦ, . . .

**Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 14 (end).**

. . . , ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἑστήκασιν, ὅτι τίς μού ἐστι μήτηρ μου[1] καὶ ἀδελφοί ; καὶ ἐκτείνας ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς τὴν χεῖρα,[2] ἔφη. οὗ τοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ,[3] οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τοῦ πατρός μου.

**Matt. xii. 46–50 (Westcott and Hort) in some respects agrees more closely.**

. . . ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἱστήκεισαν ἔξω . . . Τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου, καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου ; καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα . . . εἶπεν Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου· ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου. . . .

**Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 22.**

. . . αὐτὸς δὲ ἀληθῶς ἔλεγεν, ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπιγράψαντες τὸ κρέας ἑαυτοὺς ἐπλάνησαν, ῥᾳδιουργήσαντες καὶ εἰπόντες μὴ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ Πάσχα κρέας φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν; . . .[4]

**[Cf. Mark xii. 33.]**

**Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 16.**

. . . ὡς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς εὐαγγέλιον καλούμενον περιέχει, ὅτι ἦλθεν καταλῦσαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ἐὰν μὴ παύσησθε τοῦ θύειν, οὐ παύσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ ὀργή. . . .[5]

[1] Dindorfius omits this second μου.
[2] Dindorfius places τὴν χεῖρα before ἐπὶ.
[3] Dindorfius reads οἱ ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ, καὶ ἀδελφοί [ἀδελφαί].
[4] Text of Dindorfius.
[5] Text of Dindorfius.

# PRECANONICAL VARIANT READINGS FROM MATTHEW

## Matt. ii. 13 (Westcott and Hort).

. . . ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ⌜φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ⌝ τῷ Ἰωσὴφ λέγων Ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ ἕως ἂν εἴπω σοι· μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό. . . .

## Epiphanius, Panarion li. 8.

. . . ὤφθη αὐτῷ Ἄγγελος λέγων· ἀναστὰς λάβε τὸ παιδίον, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκά σου,[1] καὶ πορεύου εἰς Αἴγυπτον, ὅτι ζητεῖ Ἡρώδης τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου. . . .[2]

## Matt. v. 25–6 (Westcott and Hort).

. . . ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ ἕως ὅτου εἶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, μή ποτέ σε παραδῷ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷ κριτῇ, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως ἂν ἀποδῷς τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην.

## Epiphanius, Panarion xxvii. 5.

. . . ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου, ἐν ᾧ εἶ[3] ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, μή πως ὁ ἀντίδικος παραδῷ σε τῷ κριτῇ, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, καὶ ὁ ὑπηρέτης βάλῃ σε εἰς φυλακήν. ἀμὴν,[4] ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως ἂν ἀποδῷς τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην.

## Matt. v. 34–7 (Westcott and Hort).

Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ· μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστιν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως· μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὀμόσῃς, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν. ⌜ἔστω⌝ δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστίν.

## Epiphanius, Panarion xix. 6.

Καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ λέγοντος· μὴ ὀμνῦναι[5] μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν, μήτε τὴν γῆν, μήτε ἕτερον τινὰ[6] ὅρκον, ἀλλ' ἦτω ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ, καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ· τὸ περισσότερον γὰρ[7] τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ὑπάρχει.[8]

[1] Dindorfius reads τὴν γυναῖκά σου καὶ τὸ παιδίον.
[2] This text probably follows closely that of the Gospel to the Hebrews from which Epiphanius has given an extended citation.
[3] Dindorfius reads εἶ.
[4] Dindorfius omits the first ἀμήν.
[5] Dindorfius has ὀμνύναι.
[6] Dindorfius has ἕτερόν τινα.
[7] Dindorfius reads τὸ γὰρ περισσὸν.
[8] Dindorfius has ἐστίν.

**Matt. viii. 28–33 (Westcott and Hort).**

. . . Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι, χαλεποὶ λίαν ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς; Ἦν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη. οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ὑπάγετε. οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθαν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους· καὶ ἰδοὺ ὥρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν. Οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων.

**Epiphanius, Panarion lxvi. 33.**[1]

. . . καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι χαλεποὶ λίαν, ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι, καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες· ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ Ἰησοῦ Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι πρὸ καιροῦ ἦλθες βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς; οἴδαμέν σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ.[2] ἦν δὲ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἐκεῖ βοσκομένη, καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν οἱ Δαίμονες λέγοντες· εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀπόστειλον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους. καὶ ὥρμησαν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπώλοντο ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν. οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.

**Matt. xiii. 24–30, and 37–41 (Westcott and Hort).**

. . . Ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ σπείραντι καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ. ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς καὶ ἐπέσπειρεν ζιζάνια ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σίτου καὶ ἀπῆλθεν. ὅτε δὲ ἐβλάστησεν ὁ χόρτος καὶ καρπὸν ἐποίησεν, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια. προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου εἶπον αὐτῷ Κύριε, οὐχὶ καλὸν σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ σῷ ἀγρῷ; πόθεν οὖν ἔχει ζιζάνια; ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς Ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. οἱ δὲ αὐτῷ λέγουσιν Θέλεις οὖν ἀπελθόντες συλλέξωμεν αὐτά; ὁ δέ φησιν Οὔ, μή

**Epiphanius, Panarion lxvi. 65.**[3]

. . . ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὃς ἔσπειρε τὸν ἀγρὸν αὐτοῦ καλὸν σπέρμα. καὶ καθευδόντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἦλθε, καὶ ἔσπειρε ζιζάνια. εἶτα λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ, οὐχὶ καλὸν σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη, ναί. πόθεν οὖν τὰ ζιζάνια; ὁ δὲ ἀποκρινάμενος εἶπεν, ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπον, θέλεις οὖν ἀπελθόντες ἐκριζώσωμεν τὰ ζιζάνια; ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη, οὔ, μή πως ἐκριζοῦντες τὰ ζιζάνια ἐκριζώσητε καὶ τὸν σῖτον. ἀλλ' ἄφετε ἕως καιροῦ τοῦ θερι-

[1] Section 35 in Dindorfius, p. 56.
[2] Cf. Mark i. 24.
[3] Text of Dindorfius; with his quotation marks omitted.

### Matthew.

ποτε συλλέγοντες τὰ ζιζάνια ἐκριζώσητε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον· ἄφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφότερα ⌜ἕως⌝ τοῦ θερισμοῦ· καὶ ἐν καιρῷ τοῦ θερισμοῦ ἐρῶ τοῖς θερισταῖς Συλλέξατε πρῶτον τὰ ζιζάνια καὶ δήσατε αὐτὰ [εἰς] δέσμας πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι αὐτά, τὸν δὲ σῖτον ⌜συνάγετε⌝ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου. . . . 37 . . . Ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος· τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας· τὰ δὲ ζιζάνιά εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ, ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπείρας αὐτά ἐστιν ὁ διάβολος· ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς συντέλεια αἰῶνός ἐστιν, οἱ δὲ θερισταὶ ἄγγελοί εἰσιν. . . .

### Epiphanius.

σμοῦ, καὶ ἐρῶ τοῖς θερισταῖς, συλλέξατε τὰ ζιζάνια, καὶ δήσατε δεσμὰς . . .,[1] τὸν δὲ σῖτον ἀπόθεσθε ἐν τῇ ἀποθήκῃ, καὶ ἑτοιμάσατε τὰ ζιζάνια εἰς τὸ κατακαῆναι πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ. . . . ὁ τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα σπείρας ἐστὶν ὁ θεός. ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος, τὰ ζιζάνιά ἐστιν οἱ πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι, ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ὁ διάβολος, οἱ θερισταί εἰσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι, ὁ θερισμός ἐστιν ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, ὁ σῖτός ἐστιν οἱ καλοὶ ἄνθρωποι.

### Matt. xix. 4–6 (Westcott and Hort).

. . . ὁ κτίσας ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἶπεν Ἕνεκα τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν; . . . ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

### Epiphanius, Panarion xxiii. 5.

. . . ὅτι ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς. καὶ πάλιν μεθ᾽ ἕτερα, ὅτι ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. καὶ εὐθὺς προσέθηκε λέγων· οὓς[2] ὁ Θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.

### Matt. xxiii. 23–6; xxiii. 18–22; xv. 5–6, 2; xxiii. 15 (Westcott and Hort).

Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον, καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν· ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφεῖναι. ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, διυλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα τὴν δὲ κάμηλον καταπί-

### Epiphanius, Panarion xvi. 4.

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν[,] Γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι καταλελοίπατε τὰ βαρέα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸν ἔλεον, καὶ ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἄνηθον, καὶ τὸ ἡδύοσμον, καὶ τὸ πήγανον, καὶ καθαρίζετε τὸ ἐκτὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος, τὸ δὲ ἐντός ἐστι μεστὸν ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ ἀκρασίας. καὶ δοκιμά-

[1] Dindorfius repeats δεσμάς.

[2] Dindorfius reads ὃ οὖν as the canonical text. See Dindorfius' note. οὓς is the reading of the B text.

| Matthew. | Epiphanius. |
|---|---|
| *νοντες.* Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας. Φαρισαῖε τυφλέ, καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου [καὶ τῆς παροψίδος], ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ καθαρόν. | *ζετε δίκαιον εἶναι ὀμνύναι ἐν τῷ ἐπάνω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, τὸ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ παρ' ὑμῖν* [Margin: '*Fortasse τοῦ ὅρκου λέλυται*'] *τῷ ὅρκῳ λέλεκται,*[1] *καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὀμνύναι οὐδὲν εἶναι φατέ. ἐὰν δέ τις ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ ὑπεράνω*[2] *αὐτοῦ, τοῦτο δεδικαίωται. οὐχὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον βαστάζει τὸ ἐπικείμενον, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐπικαθεζομένου; καὶ ὅτι λέγετε, ἐάν τις εἴπῃ πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ κορβὰν, ὅ ἐστι δῶρον ὃ ἂν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς, καὶ*[3] *οὐκέτι μὴ τιμήσει*[4] *τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἠθετήσατε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ τῆς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ὑμῶν παραδόσεως. καὶ κυκλεύετε θάλασσαν καὶ ξηρὰν ποιῆσαι ἕνα προσήλυτον, καὶ ὅταν γένηται, ποιεῖτε αὐτὸν διπλότερον ὑμῶν υἱὸν γεέννης.*[5] |
| xxiii. 18–22 *καί* Ὃς ἂν ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐδέν ἐστιν, ὃς δ' ἂν ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ δώρῳ τῷ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ὀφείλει· . . . ὁ οὖν ὀμόσας ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ὀμνύει ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ· . . . καὶ ὁ ὀμόσας ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὀμνύει ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ. | |
| xv. 5–6 ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε Ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί Δῶρον ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς, οὐ μὴ τιμήσει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἠκυρώσατε τὸν ⌜λόγον⌝ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν. | |
| xv. 2 . . . *τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων . . .* | |
| xxiii. 15 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι περιάγετε τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηρὰν ποιῆσαι ἕνα προσήλυτον, καὶ ὅταν γένηται, ποιεῖτε αὐτὸν υἱὸν γεέννης διπλότερον ὑμῶν. | |

---

Mark vii. 11–13 ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε Ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί Κορβάν, ὅ ἐστιν Δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς, οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί, ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ⊤ ᾗ παρεδώκατε·

[1] Dindorfius, λέλυται.
[2] Dindorfius, *ἐπάνω*.
[3] Dindorfius omits *καί*.
[4] Dindorfius reads *τιμήσῃ*.
[5] Dindorfius reads *αὐτὸν υἱὸν γεέννης διπλότερον ὑμῶν*.

| Matt. xxiii. 35–6 (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion lxvi. 77.[1] |
|---|---|
| . . . ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου, ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. | . . . ὡσαύτως ὁ Κύριος λέγει· ζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης πᾶν αἷμα δικαίου ἐκχυνόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου, μέχρις αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἐκκεχυμένου ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. |

## PRECANONICAL VARIANT READINGS FROM MARK

| The Beginning of Chap. iii of Matthew's Gospel (Westcott and Hort). | The Beginning of Mark's Gospel (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion li. 6. |
|---|---|---|
| Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάνης . . . Οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. . . . | Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ Ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. . . . | vi. . . . Ματθαίου μὲν κηρύττοντος ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τὴν Μαριὰμ γεγεννηκέναι, κατὰ τὰς παρ' αὐτῷ γενεαλογίας, ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Δαβὶδ τὴν ἔνσαρκον Χριστοῦ παρουσίαν,[2] ὡς οὐχ εὑρίσκεται ὁ ἅγιος Μάρκος ταῦτα λέγων· ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ πραγματείας ποιεῖται τὴν εἰσαγωγὴν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ φησίν. ἀρχὴ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν Ἡσαίᾳ τῷ Προφήτῃ· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. |

[1] Section 78 in Dindorfius, p. 107.
[2] Dindorfius reads *θεοφάνειαν* for *παρουσίαν*.

| Ebionite Gospel as given by Epiphanius (Panarion xxx. 13). | Mark i. 10–11 (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion li. 6 (end). |
|---|---|---|
| . . . τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ[1] τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσα· σύ μου εἶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα. . . . καὶ πάλιν . . . οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, . . . | . . . τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ φωνὴ [ἐγένετο] ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. | λεγόντων αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἰδοὺ[2] δεύτερον Εὐαγγέλιον περὶ Χριστοῦ σημαῖνον, καὶ οὐδαμοῦ ἄνωθεν λέγων τὴν γέννησιν· ἀλλὰ, φησὶν, ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ κατῆλθε[3] τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ' αὐτὸν, καὶ φωνὴ, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς[4] ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐφ' ὃν ηὐδόκησα.[5] |

| Mark v. 1–14 (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion lxvi. 33.[6] |
|---|---|
| Καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν. καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου [εὐθὺς] ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, ὃς τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν, καὶ οὐδὲ ἁλύσει οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλάκις πέδαις καὶ ἁλύσεσι δεδέσθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἁλύσεις καὶ τὰς πέδας συντετρίφθαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι· καὶ διὰ παντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἦν κράζων καὶ κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν | Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος καὶ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν χοίρων διηγήσατο εἰπὼν, ὅτι ἦλθε δὲ εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Γεργεσηνῶν, καὶ ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος, ὃς ἐδεσμεῖτο ἁλύσεσι σιδηραῖς, καὶ διέσπα τὰ δεσμὰ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις διῆγε, καὶ ἔκραζεν· ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ Ἰησοῦ Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἦλθες πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι[7] ἡμᾶς. καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστι; καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι λεγεὼν, ὅτι πολλὰ δαιμόνια εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν, μὴ ἀποσταλῆναι ἔξω τῆς χώρας, ἀλλὰ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους. ἦν |

[1] Dindorfius omits τοῦ Θεοῦ.
[2] Dindorfius adds καί.
[3] Dindorfius has κατῆλθεν.
[4] Dindorfius adds μου.
[5] Strange to say Epiphanius himself (Panarion xxx. 13) gives this text evidently from a Gospel which he has previously called that of the Ebionites.
[6] In Dindorfius' edition, section 35, p. 56.
[7] Dindorfius reads βασανίσαι.

| Mark. | Epiphanius. |
| --- | --- |
| λίθοις. καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτόν, καὶ κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγει Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; ὁρκίζω σε τὸν θεόν, μή με βασανίσῃς. ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ Ἔξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν Τί ὄνομά σοι; καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Λεγιὼν ὄνομά ⌜μοι⌝, ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν· καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας. Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὄρει ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες Πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν. καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. Καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς· . . . | γὰρ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων βοσκομένη, καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. ἦσαν γὰρ ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἐπνίγησαν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν ἐν τῇ πόλει. |

| Matt. xxvi. 17–19 (Westcott and Hort). | Luke xxii. 7–13 (Westcott and Hort). | Mark xiv. 12–16 (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion xxx. 22.[1] |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες Ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμέν σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα καὶ εἴπατε αὐτῷ Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει Ὁ καιρός | Ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα· καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάνην εἰπών Πορευθέντες ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα ἵνα φάγωμεν. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ Ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν | . . . λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα; καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἀπαντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον | . . . ὡς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῷ λέγουσι ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμέν σοι τὸ Πάσχα φαγεῖν; καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος λέγει ἀπέλθετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ εὑρήσετε ἄνθρωπον βαστάζοντα κεράμιον ὕδατος, καὶ ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ |

[1] Text of Dindorfius without his quotation marks.

| Matthew. | Luke. | Mark. | Epiphanius. |
|---|---|---|---|
| μου ἐγγύς ἐστιν· πρὸς σὲ ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου. καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὡς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. | αὐτοῖς Ἰδοὺ εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰς ἣν εἰσπορεύεται. καὶ ἐρεῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας ⊤ Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος Ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; κἀκεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε. ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἰρήκει αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. | ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ, καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃ εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅτι Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει Ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ κατάλυμά μου ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἕτοιμον· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν. καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ . . . | ὅπου ὑπάγει, καὶ εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμα, ὅπου ποιήσω τὸ Πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μοῦ; καὶ δείξει ὑμῖν ὑπερῷον ἐστρωμένον, ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε. |

## PRECANONICAL VARIANT READINGS FROM LUKE

| Luke i. 26–36 (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion lxix. 40. |
|---|---|
| Ἐν δὲ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ᾗ ὄνομα Ναζαρὲτ πρὸς παρθένον ἐμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσὴφ ἐξ οἴκου Δαυείδ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ. καὶ εἰσελθὼν πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπεν Χαῖρε, | . . . ἀλλὰ, φησὶ,[1] ὡς ὁ Εὐαγγελιστής· ἐν δὲ τῳ ἕκτῳ μηνὶ ἀπεστάλη ὁ Ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, πρὸς Παρθένον μεμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ. καὶ εἰσελθὼν πρὸς αὐτὴν ἔφη, χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ |

[1] Dindorfius has φησὶν. Nazareth is not mentioned here, nor is the Virgin's name given. Perhaps Mary's name may have been omitted by Epiphanius because she has already been referred to in his text a sentence or two before this citation.

| Luke. | Epiphanius. |
| --- | --- |
| κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. ⊤ ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διεταράχθη καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἴη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ Μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ, εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ἰδοὺ συλλήμψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς Ὑψίστου κληθήσεται, καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυεὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακὼβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. εἶπεν δὲ Μαριὰμ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον Πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω; καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται, υἱὸς θεοῦ· καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἐλεισάβετ ἡ συγγενίς σου καὶ αὐτὴ συνείληφεν υἱὸν ἐν γήρει αὐτῆς, καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ στείρᾳ· . . . | τῆς ἀκολουθίας. ὡς οὖν ἡ παρθένος ἐπὶ τῷ ἀσπασμῷ ἐταράσσετο, ἔφη πρὸς αὐτήν· ἰδοὺ συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ, καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ συγγενής σου Ἐλισαβέτ συνειληφυῖα υἱὸν ἐν γήρᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ στείρᾳ. |

| Luke ii. 39 (Westcott and Hort). | Epiphanius, Panarion li. 8 (end). |
| --- | --- |
| Καὶ ὡς ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον Κυρίου, ἐπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς πόλιν ἑαυτῶν Ναζαρέτ. | . . . ὅτι φησὶν ἐν τῇ τεσσαρακοστῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνήνεγκαν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, κἀκεῖθεν[1] εἰς Ναζαρέτ.[2] |
| [Cf. Luke iii. 23–38 (Westcott and Hort), which has become much confused on account of various apparent reduplications.] | Epiphanius, Panarion lxix. 22. . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἄρχεται ἀπὸ τῶν κάτω καὶ ἐγγυτάτω, ὅτι ἦν αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὡς ἐτῶν τριάκοντα, ὢν υἱὸς ὡς ἐνομίζετο τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ, τοῦ Ἡλὶ, |

[1] Dindorfius reads *κἀκεῖθεν*.

[2] This verse I believe to have been altered to its present form on account of what Epiphanius said about its text as it existed in his time.

Epiphanius.

τοῦ Ματθὰν,[1] τοῦ Νάθαν, τοῦ Δαβὶδ, τοῦ Ἰούδα, τοῦ Ἰακὼβ, τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ, τοῦ Ναχὼρ, τοῦ Νῶε, τοῦ Λάμεχ, τοῦ Ἐνὼχ, τοῦ Σὴθ, τοῦ Ἀδὰμ, τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Luke viii. 31–3 (Westcott and Hort).

καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν. Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν ⌜βοσκομένη⌝ ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην καὶ ἀπεπνίγη. . . .

Epiphanius, Panarion lxvi. 33.[2]

καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν οἱ Δαίμονες λέγοντες, μὴ πέμψῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον, ἀλλ' ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἵνα εἰσέλθωμεν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους. καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Δαίμονες, καὶ εἰσῆλθον[3] εἰς τοὺς χοίρους. καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπώλοντο ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν.[4]

## PRECANONICAL VARIANT READINGS FROM JOHN

John i. 1–23 (Westcott and Hort).

ΕΝ ΑΡΧΗ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ⌜ἕν. ὃ γέγονεν . . . ⌝ . . . [14 Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, . . . ] 6 Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ,

Epiphanius, Panarion li. 12–13.

ἀλλὰ, ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν, ὃ γέγονε, καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ εἴδομεν αὐτόν. εἶτα, ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης. οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσει[5] περὶ τοῦ φωτὸς, ἵνα πάντες πιστεύ-

[1] In Eusebius' *Church History* (McGiffert's edition) I. vii. 6 occur the words, 'For Joseph was the son of Eli, the son of Melchi', taken from the text of Jesus' Genealogy in Luke before Eusebius. The Genealogy here given from Luke by Epiphanius seems to differ from all other known texts. Only the principal names are given.

[2] In Dindorfius' edition this is section 35, p. 57.

[3] Dindorfius omits καὶ εἰσῆλθον.

[4] This is incorrectly stated in the margin to be a reading of Mark v. 13.

[5] Dindorfius reads μαρτυρήσῃ.

John.

ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάνης· οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός . . . ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν. [14] Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας· (Ἰωάνης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέκραγεν ⌜λέγων—οὗτος ἦν ὁ εἰπών—Ὁ⌝ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν·) ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος· ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωυσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο. θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· ⌜μονογενὴς θεὸς⌝ ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάνου ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευείτας ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν Σὺ τίς εἶ; καὶ ὡμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὡμολόγησεν ὅτι Ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν Τί ⌜οὖν; [σὺ] Ἠλείας⌝ εἶ; καὶ λέγει Οὐκ εἰμί. Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Οὔ. εἶπαν οὖν αὐτῷ Τίς εἶ; ἵνα ἀπόκρισιν δῶμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς· τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ; ἔφη Ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου, καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης.

Epiphanius.

σωσι δι' αὐτοῦ. οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός. ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω· εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον. ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτὸν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι· οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων καὶ σαρκὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν. καὶ ὁ Λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, φησὶ,[1] καὶ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ, καὶ κέκραγε λέγων· οὗτος ἦν, ὃν εἶπον ὑμῖν· καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες[2] ἐλάβομεν. καὶ λέγει, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

[1] Dindorfius places φησί after Λόγος.
[2] Dindorfius reads πάντες ἡμεῖς.

**John i. 29–32 (Westcott and Hort).**

. . . Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ λέγει Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. οὗτός ἐστιν ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον Ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν· κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν ὕδατι βαπτίζων. Καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάνης λέγων ὅτι Τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν.

**Epiphanius, Panarion li. 13.**

ὡς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου Ἰωάννου δειχθήσεται, φήσαντος οὕτως· ὅτε εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἐρχόμενον τῇ ἐπαύριον, εἶπεν,[1] ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. καὶ πάλιν τῇ ἄλλῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα, ἔφη· οὗτός ἐστι, περὶ οὗ εἶπον ὑμῖν, ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν. καὶ ἐμαρτύρησε, φησὶν, Ἰωάννης λέγων, ὅτι τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς καταβαῖνον, καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν. τὸ δὲ ἐμαρτύρησε, καὶ, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν, ὃν εἶπον ὑμῖν, . . .

## PRECANONICAL VARIANT READING FROM THE ACTS

**Acts xi. 5–12 (Westcott and Hort).**

Ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐν πόλει Ἰόππῃ προσευχόμενος καὶ εἶδον ἐν ἐκστάσει ὅραμα, καταβαῖνον σκεῦός τι ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιεμένην ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἦλθεν ἄχρι ἐμοῦ· εἰς ἣν ἀτενίσας κατενόουν καὶ εἶδον τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ἤκουσα δὲ καὶ φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι Ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, θῦσον καὶ φάγε. εἶπον δὲ Μηδαμῶς, κύριε,

**Epiphanius, Panarion xxviii. 3.**

ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐν πόλει Ἰόππῃ, καὶ εἶδον ἐν μέσῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ περὶ ὥραν ἕκτην ὀθόνην καθιεμένην ἐν τέτρασιν ἀρχαῖς, ἐν ᾗ ἦν πάντα τὰ τετράποδα καὶ ἑρπετά. καὶ εἶπέ μοι, θύσον[2] καὶ φάγε. ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπον, Κύριε μηδαμῶς,[3] ὅτι οὐδέποτε κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου. ἀπεκρίθη δέ μοι ἐκ δευτέρου φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ·[4] ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σὺ μὴ κοίνου. καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς ἰδοὺ δύο

[1] Dindorfius reads λέγει.
[2] Dindorfius, θῦσον.
[3] *Ibid.*, μηδαμῶς, κύριε.
[4] *Ibid.*, μοι φωνὴ ἐκ δευτέρου . . . οὐρανοῦ, ἃ . . .

| Acts. | Epiphanius. |
| --- | --- |
| ὅτι κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον οὐδέποτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ⌜ἐκ δευτέρου φωνὴ⌝ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ᾿Α ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν σὺ μὴ κοίνου. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρίς, καὶ ἀνεσπάσθη πάλιν ἅπαντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξαυτῆς τρεῖς ἄνδρες ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐν ᾗ ⌜ἦμεν⌝, ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ Καισαρίας πρός με. εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμά μοι συνελθεῖν αὐτοῖς μηδὲν διακρίναντα. | ἄνδρες εἰσήκεισαν[1] εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ εἶπέ μοι τὸ πνεῦμα, πορεύου σὺν αὐτοῖς μηδὲν διακρινόμενος. |

[1] Dindorfius, *εἰστήκεισαν*.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
9/13